TRANSLATIONS
OF
CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

TERTULLIAN
CONCERNING THE RESURRECTION OF THE FLESH

A. SOUTER, D. Litt.

FIDE ET VIRTUTE
CANCELLED
W. E. Gladstone
St. Deiniol's Library
CANCELLED
Hawarden, Clwyd
Founded by
The Rt. Hon. W. E. Gladstone

C
617
16

ST. DEINIOL'S LIBRARY,
HAWARDEN
CANCELLED

no sub

TRANSLATIONS OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

General Editors: W. J. SPARROW-SIMPSON, DD.,
W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE, B.D.

SERIES II

LATIN TEXTS

TERTULLIAN

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/tertullianconger0000asou

TRANSLATIONS OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE . SERIES II
LATIN TEXTS

GLADSTONE'S LIBRARY,
HAWARDEN.

TERTULLIAN
CONCERNING THE RESURRECTION OF THE FLESH

By A. SOUTER, D.LITT.

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE. London
The Macmillan Company: New York
1922

ST. DEINIOL'S LIBRARY,
HAWARDEN.

TO

MY DEAR FRIEND

THE REVEREND PROFESSOR

HERBERT ADAMS GIBBONS,

M.A., B.D., PH.D., LITT.D.,

PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY,

CHEVALIER DE LA LÉGION D'HONNEUR,

HISTORIAN

AND

CHAMPION OF OPPRESSED NATIONS,

IN GRATITUDE

FOR

A TWELVE-YEARS' FRIENDSHIP

PREFACE

THE choice of further works of Tertullian as subjects for translation in this series was determined by the list of the more important works of Tertullian given by Dr. Swete in his *Patristic Study* (London, 1902), p. 145. Among these appears the *De Carnis Resurrectione;* and certainly, whether it be considered from the point of view of subject-matter or of style, it is one of the most significant and valuable of its author's writings. At the present time its reading may be especially commended to the bereaved, at least to such of them as value Scripture teaching, as being likely to afford them much more solid comfort than they will get from spiritualistic séances.

In this work, composed with great care, Tertullian shows more traces of rhetorical training than usual (cf. c. 5). In the wonderful c. 12 he even blossoms into poetry. I cannot name a more suitable introduction to the study of his works than this *De Carnis Resurrectione.*

The general features of the present volume do not differ greatly from those of previous volumes, to which the reader is referred for information as

to my plan and purpose, but I am glad to be able to publish in the Appendix a collation of a very important manuscript, hitherto unknown, which makes the present volume indispensable to all serious students of Tertullian in the original Latin.

The Rev. J. H. Baxter's kind reading of the proofs has been very helpful to me.

A. SOUTER.

Aberdeen,
January 19, 1921.

INTRODUCTION

§ 1.—On Tertullian's Life and Works

Of Tertullian, as of many another who has rendered pre-eminent service to humanity, almost nothing is known. His full name was Quintus Septimius Florens Tertullianus, and he was a native of the Roman province of Africa, which corresponded roughly in area to the modern Tunis. He was of pagan parentage, and underwent a complete training as a lawyer. He appears to have visited Italy, but he spent the greatest part of his life in the city of Carthage, which had been refounded by Julius Caesar about a hundred years after the younger Scipio had laid it waste. The city had become once again a great centre, and Christianity must have reached it at an early period, probably direct from Italy. In Africa the new religion found a favourable soil, a fact not altogether undue to the Semitic origin of the old Punic stock, which found something akin to itself in the daughter of Judaism. The number of churches in Africa in Tertullian's time probably greatly exceeded the total of Italy itself. And this Christianity seems to have been more Latin than Greek. The most highly educated of the

provincials in Africa were acquainted with Greek, but the proportion of such persons was far less than would have been found in Italy.

We have no evidence as to the date of Tertullian's birth, but if we place it about A.D. 160, we shall probably not be far wrong. The date of his conversion is equally unknown, but it may be assigned to the period of mature manhood. He was a man of ardent temperament, unbounded energy and great creative faculty. In such a man conversion was sure to be followed at the earliest possible interval by active work on behalf of the Faith, and for him the pen was the obvious instrument. All his knowledge of law, literature and philosophy was at once enlisted on the side of the persecuted religion. Like a later convert from paganism, St. Ambrose, he must have taken up the study of the Scriptures as eagerly as he had followed his earlier pursuits. We have no satisfactory evidence that he held any office in the Church. It is safest to regard him as an early forerunner of a succession of Christian laymen, men like Pelagius, Marius Mercator, Junilius and Cassiodorus, who have had their share in building up the body of Christian doctrine.

The strongly ascetic vein in Tertullian led him later to adopt the doctrines of the Montanists. This sect took its name from Montanus of Pepuza in Phrygia, and among its tenets was the assertion of prophetic gifts in opposition to the regularly constituted ministry; millenarism, and abstinence

from every sort of union between the sexes. The influence of Montanism spread gradually in the West, and reached Africa almost certainly from Italy, but it is improbable that it had become associated with a declared sect in Africa in Tertullian's time. It represented rather a tendency within the bosom of the Church. But that tendency gained more and more power with Tertullian himself, and in his later works he accepts the doctrine of the new prophecy, and inaugurates the arbitrary rule of individual spiritual gifts, thus undermining the authority of the Old and New Testaments as well as that of the Church. He contradicts Scripture in urging the Christian to face persecution, in depreciating marriage, in making regulations for fasting, and other minor matters.

But these and other exaggerations, though they have deprived Tertullian of canonisation, in no way affect his importance as the earliest of the Latin Fathers. His great learning, his obvious sincerity and his burning eloquence are to be set over against such excesses, as well as against the occasional coarseness which will break out in the writings of a Tertullian, a Jerome and an Augustine, who have in their unregenerate days become too familiar with uncleanness. In originality he is inferior to none of these. In doctrine and in language alike he is a pioneer of Western Christianity. To him we owe the first formulation of the doctrine of the Trinity; to him we owe a great part of the Christian Latin vocabulary. He

is the earliest Latin writer to quote Scripture with any freedom, and he is the first of that roll of noble names, Tertullian, Cyprian, Hilary, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, which no Christian literature in any language can match.

Yet here, also, we have our treasure in earthen vessels. Tertullian is the most difficult of all Latin prose writers, outdoing the fully developed Tacitean style in that brevity which inevitably becomes obscurity. His vocabulary is curiously compounded of technical legal language, Grecisms and colloquialisms, and in the absence of a special lexicon or a concordance to his works it is a task of extreme difficulty at times to ascertain precisely what shade of meaning to assign to a word. The importance of Tertullian is becoming so widely recognised now that the task of compiling such a lexicon may be commended to a patient scholar as one of the most urgent requirements of Latin scholarship. But we shall never know his vocabulary and idiom in the way that it is possible to know that of Jerome, Augustine or Gregory. The comparative neglect of his works in the Middle Ages has resulted in the survival of a pathetically scanty list of good manuscripts. Much of his text will, in consequence, never be restored with absolute certainty.

The list of his surviving works, with the dates now generally [1] assigned to them, is as follows :—

[1] I follow d'Alès, pp. xiii. ff., slightly different from Harnack, *Gesch. altchr. Litt.*, II. 2. (Leipzig, 1904), pp. 295 f.

Ad Martyras	Feb. or March 197.
Ad Nationes	after Feb. 197.
Apologeticus	autumn 197.
De Testimonio Animae	between 197 and 200.
De Spectaculis	about 200.
De Praescriptione Haereticorum	about 200.
De Oratione	between 200 and 206
De Baptismo	
De Patientia	
De Paenitentia	
De Cultu Feminarum	
Ad Uxorem	
Adversus Hermogenen	
Adversus Iudaeos	
De Virginibus Velandis	about 206.
Adversus Marcionem, Libri I.–IIII.	207–8.
De Pallio	209.
Adversus Valentinianos	between 208 and 211.
De Anima	
De Carne Christi	
De Carnis Resurrectione	
Adversus Marcionem, Liber V	
De Exhortatione Castitatis	
De Corona	211.
Scorpiace	211 or 212.
De Idololatria	211 or 212.
Ad Scapulam	end of 212.

The following are definitely Montanist:—

De Fuga in Persecutione	213.
Adversus Praxean	after 213.
De Monogamia	after 213.
De Ieiunio	after 213.
De Pudicitia	between 217 and 222.

Besides these, several works by him have been lost. It is also to be noted that he issued the *Apologeticus* (probably) and the *De Spectaculis* (certainly) in Greek, as well as a Greek work on Baptism.

Of annotated editions of Tertullian's complete works, the best is that by Franciscus Oehler (Lipsiae, 3 vols., 1853, 1854). The best text of the following works is to be found in the Vienna *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, Vols. XX. and XLVII. (Vindobonae et Lipsiae), 1890, 1906): *De Spectaculis*, *De Idololatria*, *Ad Nationes*, *De Testimonio Animae*, *Scorpiace*, *De Oratione*, *De Baptismo*, *De Pudicitia*, *De Ieiunio*, *De Anima*, *De Patientia*, *De Carnis Resurrectione*, *Adversus Hermogenen*, *Adversus Valentinianos*, *Adversus Omnes Haereses*,[1] *Adversus Praxean*, *Adversus Marcionem*. The best work on the language of Tertullian is H. Hoppe, *Syntax und Stil des Tertullian* (Leipzig, 1903); on his theology, A. d'Alès, *La Théologie de Tertullien* (Paris, 1905); on his New Testament citations, H. Rönsch, *Das Neue Testament Tertullian's* (Leipzig, 1871).

[1] This book is perhaps the work of Victorinus of Pettau († 303).

§ 2. The *De Carnis Resurrectione*

The Argument

The treatise of Tertullian on "The Resurrection of the Body"[1] is not the earliest surviving Christian treatise dealing with its subject. That honour belongs to the Greek treatises preserved under the names of Justin and Athenagoras, which were doubtless known to him.[2] A short summary of Tertullian's argument is here furnished.

The doctrine of the resurrection of the body, which is fundamental to Christianity, is an object of ridicule to the mob, who yet offer worship and sumptuous repasts to the burned bodies of their dead. Philosophers like Epicurus and Seneca are in their company, while others such as Pythagoras and Plato who do believe in another life, spoil this beautiful idea by the absurd doctrine of metempsychosis. Christ confounded the Sadducees, who were disciples of Epicurus rather than of the prophets, and Tertullian here sets out to confound the heretics Marcion, Basilides, Valentinus and Apelles who admit the immortality of the soul, but deny the resurrection of the body. The immortality of the soul finds few to question it. It is a primordial truth, easy of acceptance. It

[1] Tertullian avoids the use of *corpus* in this connexion, because it was sometimes used of the *anima* also.

[2] Cf. d'Alès, p. 153, n. 2, to whose account of our present treatise I am greatly indebted in this section. An excellent English summary is to be found in Bp. Kaye's *Ecclesiastical History of the Second and Third Centuries*, pp. 134-145 (of cheap edition).

is otherwise with the resurrection of the body. On this point pagan prejudice is strong, and the heretics draw some of their arguments from it. They insist on the body's weakness, its earthly origin, its return to earth.

To this Tertullian answers with a remarkable eulogy of the flesh. God could not abandon what was the outward form of his own Christ, dear to Him beyond all others. Further, such a result does not go beyond divine power. He who could create the universe out of nothing, or transform pre-existing matter into the present order of things, can surely remake what He has made before. Many analogies support this view. Day comes out of night, the stars shine after an eclipse, the seasons come round again, vegetable life finds its origin in corruption, and, finally, the phœnix, according even to Scripture,[1] rises from its ashes. The Lord who said: "Ye are more valuable than many sparrows," could do no less for man.

But resurrection is not merely appropriate. It is actually necessary, if we admit that the judgment of God is perfect. It would not be so, if man were not judged exactly as he had lived. Therefore the whole man, body and soul, must come to judgment. The enemies of resurrection try to dissever the natural unity of human nature. This they cannot do. The secret movements of the soul are placed by God in the physical organ called the heart (Matt. ix. 4; v. 28). Tertullian recog-

[1] On this curious mistake see the note on c. 12, below.

nises no mental operation that does not depend on the body. Wherever we place the seat of thought, we must admit that it borrows the service of a corporeal power. The expression of the face indicates the emotions of the soul. True it is that the initiative belongs to the soul. But perfect justice would render to each attendant according to its works. The name "attendant" would seem unsuitable, because the body is an instrument rather than a slave. But why should not the instrument itself have its just share of honour or dishonour? But the body is not really an instrument: it is an integral part of the moral being. Such is the doctrine of the Apostle (1 Thess. iv. 4; 1 Cor. vi. 20). The idea that the soul, apart from the body, could experience neither pain nor pleasure, though widely held,[1] is to be rejected. The soul is a body of a special nature, capable of impressions suited to itself, as the instances of the souls of the rich man and Lazarus prove. The body is restored to the soul with the one object that divine justice may be satisfied. For the acts belonging especially to itself, thoughts, desires, resolutions, the soul will have its separate reward or punishment: those which were carried out by the body, await its reunion with the soul.

To sum up, everything conspires to prove the resurrection of the body; the dignity of the flesh, divine omnipotence, analogies from nature, the

[1] Even by Tertullian himself, as d'Alès points out, in *Apol.*, 48, *Test. An.* 4 (p. 145, n. 1).

requirements of divine judgment. All this part serves as a preface to the second and third parts of the treatise which contain the proof from Scripture. The question Tertullian puts to himself and the heretics is this: Do these passages have the soul alone in view, or the body also?

God's edict that the dead will rise again, has the body in view. When God pronounced the sentence of death on man (Gen. iii. 19), this of course referred to the body. When Christ said to the Jews (John ii. 19): "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up," He spoke of raising up what they would have destroyed, namely, His body. The words must be taken as they stand, and not interpreted allegorically. Certainly there are allegories in Scripture, but they are not to be found everywhere. The numerous passages concerning resurrection ought to be understood literally; a matter so fundamental for Christian doctrine must have been set forth with absolute clearness. It is impossible to see in resurrection either an illumination of the soul by the grace of faith, or an immediate glorification of this soul after death. In St. Luke (xxi. 26 ff.) the Lord describes the scenes which will precede resurrection and judgment. Now, these signs do not yet show themselves. Therefore the spiritual resurrection of which heretics speak would be premature. St. Paul speaks to the Colossians (ii. iii.) of spiritual resurrection, but the context is clear, and does not exclude bodily resurrection which is

affirmed elsewhere by the same Apostle (Gal. v. 5 ; Phil. iii. 11 f. ; Gal. vi. 9 ; 2 Tim. i. 18 ; 1 Tim. vi. 14–15, 1 and 2 Thess. *passim*), by St. John (1 John iii. 2) and by St. Peter (Acts iii. 19 f.). The Apocalypse announces (Rev. xx.) a general resurrection for the end of time, and not the spiritual resurrection which is a daily event. Further, if one were to appeal to allegorical interpretation, it would be easy to find the bodily resurrection predicted in many passages of the prophets. In Ezekiel's vision (c. xxxvii.) there is more than a simple allegory ; but heresy struggles to confine it to the restoration of Israel. This interpretation is, if not false, at least too exclusive. On the contrary, it presupposes the first interpretation, just as the image presupposes the reality ; and God's words to the prophet confirm this point of view. Ezekiel, prophesying before the Dispersion, wished to inculcate belief in the resurrection of the flesh, a lesson always living and often forgotten. Besides, the other prophets echo his words (Mal. iv. 2 f. ; Isa. lxvi. 14, xxvi. 19, lxvi. 22–24). For the manner of the resurrection we can trust to the divine power.[1]

The Gospels also give evidence in favour of bodily resurrection. Some people take advantage of the parables to turn the whole teaching of Jesus into allegory. But we have no right to forget that Jesus frequently speaks unfiguratively. This is

[1] Here Tertullian quotes a passage from the Book of Enoch, which to him had the value of Scripture.

particularly true of the Judgment and the resurrection of the body, both when He threatens (Matt. xi. 22–24), and when He promises (Matt. x. 7; Luke xiv. 14). Besides, He said distinctly that He came to save that which was lost (Luke xix. 10; cf. John vi. 39–40). Is not "that which was lost" the whole man? Nothing must be wanting there. Full redemption must include both body and soul. Jesus also says, "Fear him who is able to cast both body and soul into hell" (Matt. x. 28). It is impossible here to turn the one into the other, seeing that the sacred text contrasts the body with the soul. Unless to rise again, the body could not fall into gehenna. And as this avenging fire is inextinguishable, everlasting also must be the punishment of the body which the divine justice hands over to it, not to be consumed, but to be tortured. Other words of the Lord confirm this doctrine (Matt. x. 29; John vi. 39; Matt. viii. 11, etc.). Answering the Sadducees (Matt. xxii. 23 f.) who did not believe even in the immortality of the soul, He implicitly affirms that Scripture teaches such a resurrection as they denied, that is, complete resurrection. If He compares the condition of the elect with that of angels (Matt. xxii. 30), if He declares that the flesh is of no use, we cannot conclude anything from that against resurrection; He wished merely to urge His hearers to the life of the spirit. Finally, in raising the dead, He gave as it were the earnest of a general resurrection, by miracles which were,

besides, much less than the miracle of His own resurrection.

From the Gospels he passes to the Apostolic writings. The Apostles introduced no new teaching about resurrection beyond the great fact of the Lord's resurrection. Their only opponents were the Sadducees. Paul confessed his belief in resurrection before the sanhedrin, as between the Sadducees and the Pharisees (Acts xxiii. 6), before Agrippa (Acts xxvi. 8), and before the court of Areopagus (Acts xvii. 31), where he provoked smiles of incredulity. He inculcates the same belief in almost all his Epistles. We ought not, therefore, as the heretics do, to stop at certain obscure texts, such as 2 Cor. iv. 16, v. 1 f., 1 Thess. iv. 14 f., 1 Cor. xv 51 f., 2 Cor. v. 6 f., Eph. iv. 22 f., Rom. viii. 8 f., vi. 6, and above all, 1 Cor. xv. 50. Of all these texts he gives an exegesis favourable to his argument. This last text he explains as referring to men of earthly inclinations. Further, all flesh will rise again: but, to enter into possession of the heavenly heritage, one must be transfigured. Those who pretend, in the name of St. Paul, to exclude all flesh, without distinction, from the Kingdom of God, have only to raise their eyes to heaven, and there they will see, seated at the Father's right hand, Jesus, God and man, eternal Word and last Adam, with His flesh and His blood, purer than ours, yet of the same nature. This is the pledge of our resurrection. But the flesh would not be able to penetrate this Kingdom,

except it were first rid of all corruption and reclothed with immortality.

What will be the condition of the glorified bodies? According to St. Paul (1 Cor. xv. 36 ff.), the raised body will be to the mortal body what the plant is to the seed. God sowed a living body (ver. 44). This perishable life must give place to the full life of the spirit. The mortal life must be absorbed by life, that the body may put on immortality, not by a destruction, but by a change which will communicate to it a new way of being. Divine justice would not be pleased with a substitution which would withdraw the moral being from reward or punishment. All physical mutilations or infirmities will have disappeared, as the resurrection is complete. Glorified bodies will have no suffering, but will enter into the possession of cloudless happiness (Isa. xxxv. 10; Rev. vii. 17; xxi. 4). Even the clothes and the shoes of the Israelites were miraculously preserved in the desert, as were the lives of the three boys in the furnace, of Jonah, of Enoch and of Elijah; so that there is no need to take such passages figuratively. The mysteries of eternity *do* concern our mortal natures (cf. 1 Cor. iii. 22). As regards the coarseness of bodily functions, resurrection requires all parts of the body, but not their use. The body will abstain in future from all acts that have no purpose in the Kingdom of God. The Lord Himself likened His elect to angels (Matt. xxii. 30). The conclusion: all flesh will rise again, identical, complete; Jesus

Christ, Mediator between God and man, in His own person united flesh and spirit. The flesh may seem to perish, yet it is only temporarily eclipsed. It will appear again one day before God to hear itself invited to glory. This is the charter of salvation, brought to men by Jesus Christ, and, adds Tertullian, illustrated in these latter times by the effusion of the new prophecy, due to the Paraclete.

The Manuscripts, etc.

The manuscript authorities employed by Emil Kroymann for his standard edition (*Corp. Scr. Eccl. Lat.*, Vol. XLVII., Vindobonae et Lipsiae, 1906) are these:—

M = Montepessulanus (of Montpellier) 54 (saec. xi.).

P = Paterniacensis (of Paeterlingen, now of Schletstadt) 439 (saec. xi.).

F = Florentinus Magliabechianus Conv. soppr. vi. 10 (saec. xv.).

A glance at Kroymann's apparatus will show that they are somewhat closely related to one another. I venture a conjecture that they hark back to an archetype in Visigothic script. If that be the case, then this Visigothic MS. may itself be a copy of a manuscript brought to Spain from Africa, Tertullian's own country.

In addition to these three manuscripts, Kroymann has compared the text in the following old

printed editions of Tertullian, which were, in part at least, based on manuscripts now lost. They are:—

B = the edition of Jean Gagney (Martin Mesnart), (Paris, 1545).

R^1 = the edition of Beatus Rhenanus (Basle, 1521).

R^3 = the edition of Beatus Rhenanus (Basle, 1539).

C = the readings of a manuscript lent by the Englishman, John Clement, to Pamelius (Antwerp, 1579).

Recently, the distinguished patristic scholar, Dom André Wilmart, O.S.B., of St. Michael's Abbey, Farnborough, discovered a manuscript unknown to Kroymann, containing the *De Carnis Resurrectione* among other treatises.[1] Of this manuscript, Troyes 523 (saec. xii), formerly of the Cistercian Abbey, Clairvaux, I furnish a collation in the Appendix, as an indispensable supplement to Kroymann's edition.

[1] A private letter of Nov. 11, 1919, to the present writer; see now *Académie des Inscr. & Belles-Lettres, Comptes rendus des Séances de l'Année 1920*, 380 ff.

BODLEIAN LIBRARY,
OXFORD.

TERTULLIAN

CONCERNING THE RESURRECTION OF THE FLESH

1. THE Christian's confidence is bound up with the resurrection of the dead. That makes us believers: truth compels belief in it; and truth is revealed by God. But the crowd mocks, judging that nothing is left over after death. And yet they offer sacrifices for the dead, and indeed with the most devoted duty, in keeping with the character of the deceased and the times when particular food is in season.[1] They claim that they feel nothing, and yet have actually desires. But *I* will rather laugh at the crowd at the time when they are cruelly burning up the dead themselves. They both court and insult with the same fire those whom they afterwards gluttonously feed. What a devotion this is that makes fun of cruelty! Are they sacrificing or insulting, when they burn things in honour of those that were burnt themselves? It is a fact that even the philosophers share the opinion of

[1] For the rime here, pro *moribus eorum*, pro *temporibus esculentorum*, cf. Hoppe, *Syntax u. Stil des Tert.*, p. 165.

the crowd. Epicurus[1] teaches that there is nothing after death. Seneca[2] also says that everything comes to an end after death, even death itself. But it is enough if the nowhit inferior philosophy of Pythagoras and Empedocles, and the Platonists, claim on the contrary that the soul is immortal, nay more, assert almost in our way that it is even capable of returning to bodies. Although they are deemed to return not into the same bodies, although not merely into human bodies, as Euphorbus into Pythagoras, as Homer into a peacock, they at least proclaimed a bodily restoration of the soul. It was more tolerable to change than to deny its quality; they at least knocked[3] at the door of the truth, although they did not actually enter into possession of it. Thus the world even in its mistaken way is acquainted with the resurrection of the dead.[4]

2. If, however, there is some body or other which is in the eyes of God[5] more akin to the Epicureans than to the prophets, we shall know what answer the Sadducees get from Christ. It was left for Christ to reveal all that had been aforetime hidden, to order that which was in doubt, to com-

cf. Matt. xxii. 23-33

[1] Cf. Usener, *Epicurea*, no. 336, pp. 226 f.; Usener, however, fails to note the present passage.

[2] Seneca, *Troades* 397, post mortem nihil est, ipsaque mors nihil.

[3] I have preferred to keep the metaphor; Hoppe, p. 137, n., defines *pulsare* here as "to touch."

[4] For this, the most frequent type of ending (– ⏑ – ⏑), see Hoppe, pp. 154 ff.

[5] Oehler interprets this to mean among the Jews or the Christians, in Scripture.

plete what was but assayed, to realise[1] what had been preached,[2] and assuredly to prove the resurrection of the dead not merely through Himself, but also in Himself. But now we are preparing for other Sadducees, sharers of their view: they recognise a half resurrection, of course of the soul only, disdaining the flesh even as they spurn the Lord Himself of the flesh. Therefore[3] no others grudge salvation to the bodily nature except heretics who worship another divinity. Therefore feeling forced to give even Christ a different position, lest He should be regarded as belonging to the Creator, they first erred[4] in the matter of His flesh itself, either contending with Marcion and Basilides that it had no real existence, or maintaining with the schools of Valentinus and with Apelles[5] that it had a character of its own. And thus it follows that they banish the salvation of that nature in which they deny that Christ had any share, knowing full well that it is furnished with a perfect argument for its resurrection, if

[1] For *repraesentare*, see d'Alès, pp. 357, 358.

[2] For this riming of first syllables, prae*libata*, prae*dicata*, see Hoppe, p. 168.

[3] See *Thesaurus*, V. 533, 23.

[4] On the tenses *coacti*, *habeatur*, *errauerunt*, cf. Hoppe, p. 68.

[5] Kroymann follows the MSS. in reading *Appellen*, but in such matters these MSS. are worth nothing; the Greek name was *Apelles*. Similarly *Apollo* and *Apollos* are often corrupted to *Appollo* and *Appollos*. The heretics here mentioned were Gnostics; Marcion of Sinope in Pontus broke with the Church in Rome about A.D. 144. Basilides taught about A.D. 120 to 140 at Alexandria. Valentinus, an Egyptian, was trained at Alexandria, and left the Church in Rome in the period A.D. 135 to 160. Tertullian's tractate, *Aduersus Valentinianos*, is extant. Apelles was a pupil of Marcion.

already in Christ flesh rose again. Wherefore we also have previously issued a volume entitled *Concerning Christ's Flesh*, in which we prove it at once real in contrast with the unreality of an apparition, and claim it as human in view of a special quality of nature, the condition of which has entitled Christ both Man and Son of Man. In proving Him possessed of flesh and body, we also in like manner confound[1] them by objecting that no other is believed to be God save the Creator, while we show that Christ in whom God is apprehended is such as He is promised by the Creator to be. Then confounded concerning God as the Creator of flesh and Christ as its redeemer, they will presently be convicted also in regard to the resurrection of the flesh in like manner.[2] It is almost in this way of course that we say a discussion must be begun with the heretics—for order also always demands to be traced from first beginnings[3]—that we must first be quite certain about Him, by whom the matter of our questioning is said to have been arranged, and further also heretics through their consciousness of weakness never engage in a discussion of the regulation type. For knowing well how they are struggling to recommend another divinity against the God of

[1] On the use of *obducere* in Tertullian, see the notes referred to in the index to Tert., *Apol.*, ed. Mayor.

[2] I think the difficulty here is best got over by making *congruenter* the last word of this sentence, instead of the first word of the next.

[3] For the prepos. with adjective, see Hoppe, p. 98.

the universe who is known naturally to all from the evidences of His works, and who is assuredly both earlier in His mysteries and more evident in His preachings, under the pretext of what appears to be a more pressing matter, namely human salvation itself, which must be sought before everything else, they begin with questionings about resurrection, because it is harder to believe in the resurrection of the flesh than in one divinity; and thus they gradually adapt to suit the idea of a second divinity a discussion which is deprived of the strength of its own order, and is rather loaded with doubts that cheapen the flesh; and this they do from the very shattering and changing of their hope. For every one who has been cast down or dislodged from his stand on that hope which he had conceived in the Creator, is now easily diverted to the founder of another hope, who is to be looked up to even without this inducement. It is by differing promises that difference in gods is commended. We see many caught in this way, being first dashed from their belief in the resurrection of the flesh before they give up their belief in the unity of godhead. Therefore, so far as heretics are concerned,[1] we have shown what wedge formation[2] we must employ in our attack. And we have already closed with each of them under the appropriate head: on the one hand, with regard

[1] For the omission of the *attinet*, cf. Hoppe, p. 146, n. 1; the use occurs in Ov. Tac. (cf. Furneaux on *Germ.*, 21, § 3); cf. Fr, *quant-à*.

[2] For this metaphor from a scaling-party, see Hoppe, p. 203, n. 4.

to one God and His Christ against Marcion,[1] on the other hand, with regard to the Lord's flesh[2] also against four heresies, to settle this question especially first; that I may now discuss the resurrection of the flesh only, as if it were uncertain even in our minds, if only for all that it is a fixed institution[3] of the Creator—for there are many untutored, very many hesitant in their faith and yet more simple-minded, who will have to be taught, put in the right way, fortified—because unity of divinity will be defended from this side also. For as it is shattered if the resurrection of the flesh be denied, so also if defended it is firmly established. But the soul's salvation is I believe beyond doubt:[4] for almost all heretics, in whatever way they understand it, yet do not deny it. It is the concern of some individual[5] called Lucanus, who does not spare even this nature: for, as a follower of Aristotle, he breaks it up and substitutes something else for it, for he is going to rise again in some third nature, neither soul nor flesh, that is, not man, but a bear, perhaps, being a Lucanian.[6] He[7] also has received at our

[1] *Aduersus Marcionem*, lib. ii., iii.

[2] *De Carne Christi*.

[3] Read with Thörnell (*Studia Tertullianea*, Upsala, 1918), p. 27, *dum sic quoque certa penes creatorem*.

[4] Hoppe, p. 138, n. 1, interprets *retractatus* as "treatment," "investigation."

[5] On this *aliquis*, often used with proper names in Tert., see Hoppe, p. 105. This Lucanus was a follower of Marcion.

[6] The name *Lucanus* was originally an adj. or a tribal name meaning Lucanian (Southern Italy). The Lucanian district was famous for bears; hence Tertullian's gibe.

[7] For *iste* = *ille*, see Hoppe, p. 105.

hands an exhaustive work[1] *Concerning the whole Condition of the Soul.*[2] While maintaining that it especially is immortal, we recognise the wasting away of flesh alone and claim emphatically that it is repaired,[3] and we have reduced to the regular body of matter such things as elsewhere also we have postponed in view of our slight incursion into the causes. For as it is regular to have a foretaste of certain things, so also it is needful to postpone them, provided that of which we have a foretaste is completed by its own substance, and that which is put off, is brought back in its own name.[4]

3. It is indeed possible[5] to derive wisdom in matters divine from thoughts common to all, but as evidence of truth, not as an aid to falsehood, a wisdom that is in accordance with, not contrary to, the divine arrangement. For there are certain things that are known even by the light of nature, as for example the immortality of the soul in the case of many, as our God in the minds of all.[6] I will therefore make use even of the opinion of one[7] Plato, when he proclaims: "every soul is mortal;" I will avail myself also of the consciousness of a people invoking a God of gods; I will take

Plato, *Phaedr.* c. 24, p. 245

[1] For *stilus* thus used, see Hoppe, p. 123.

[2] This work no longer survives, unless, indeed, it be our *De Anima*, as the exordium of that work suggests it may be.

[3] For the rime *defectionem*, *refectionem*, cf. Hoppe, p. 165.

[4] For this rather uncommon ending (– ⏑ – – ⏑ ⏓), occurring in 13% of the cases, see Hoppe, pp. 156 f.

[5] For *est* with the infinitive, see Hoppe, p. 47. Note also how Reason is here kept in its place.

[6] On this thought, cf. d'Alès, p. 39.

[7] For this *aliquis*, see Hoppe, p. 105.

advantage also of the other general thoughts, which proclaim God as judge: "God sees" and "I commend to God."[1] But when they say: "what is dead is dead" and "live while you can" and "after death all is over, even death itself," then I shall remember both that "the mind" of the crowd was considered "ashes" by God, and that even "the wisdom of the world" was declared "folly";[2] then, if a heretic flies for refuge to the crowd's faults or the world's inventions, I will say: "depart from the heathen, heretic; although you are all one, you who invent a God, yet, while you do this in the name of Christ, while you look upon yourself as a Christian, you are different from a heathen;[3] give him back his own thoughts, because he is not instructed even in your learning. Why do you lean on a 'blind guide,' if you see? Why are you being clothed by the unclothed, if 'you have put on Christ'? Why do you use another's shield, if you have been armed by an apostle? Let him rather learn from you to confess the resurrection of the flesh, than you from him to deny it;[4] because if it were the bounden duty even of Christians to deny it, it would be enough for them to get instruction out of their own knowledge, not from the crowd's ignorance." Besides, he will be no Christian who denies what Christians confess, and he will use, to deny it, arguments which the non-[5]

cf. Seneca, supra, c. 1

cf. Isa. xliv. 20
cf. 1 Cor. iii. 19

cf. Matt. xv. 14, etc.
cf. Gal. iii. 27, etc.
cf. Eph. vi. 11–17

[1] Cf. *Apol.*, c. 17 ex. with Mayor's note.
[2] See d'Alès, p. 40.
[3] For *alius ab*, see Hoppe, p. 36.
[4] For the rime in *confiteri*, *diffiteri*, cf. Hoppe, p. 165.
[5] For this *non* closely associated with one word, see Hoppe, p. 107.

Christian does not use. Take away, then, from the heretics the wisdom they share with the heathen, that from the scriptures alone they may support their questionings, and they will not be able to stand. For universal thoughts are commended by their very simplicity, the common experience of opinions and the friendliness of views, and they are regarded as all the more reliable because they define what is "uncovered and open" and known to all; moreover, divine reason is in the heart, not on the surface, and is very often hostile to what is evident.[1] cf. Heb. iv. 13

4. Therefore the heretics immediately begin their building with this, and add to their building[2] from the materials by which they know that minds are easily taken captive, namely from the pleasing union of the senses. Is there any difference between what you would hear from a heretic and what you would hear from a heathen? and would you sooner or rather hear it from the former or the latter? Is there not at once, is there not everywhere vilification of the flesh, of its origin, its substance, its misfortune, its whole fate, being unclean from the beginning as from the dregs of the soil, more unclean thereafter from the mud of its seed, worthless, weak, guilty, burdensome,[3] and after it

[1] For the neut. of the adj. thus used, see Hoppe, p. 97. For the thought of the passage, which is quite in Tertullian's manner, cf. d'Alès, pp. 34, 36.

[2] For *interstruere*, thus absolutely used, see Hoppe, p. 134.

[3] I take *molestae* to be a gloss on the unclassical *onerosae;* the reading of T (*Decensis*, the Troyes MS.) confirms my view. Yet the *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum* appears to contain no such gloss.

has passed through all this accusation of meanness, doomed to lapse back to its origin, the earth, and thus named a corpse,[1] and even after bearing that name is destined to perish and then pass from that state to become no name at all, to end in the death even of every name?[2] "Do you then," says the philosopher, "seek to persuade it that[3] after it has been snatched away from your sight and touch and recollection,[4] it will one day cease to be wasted away and become unimpaired again, cease to be void and become solid, cease to be emptied and become full, cease to be nothing at all and become something,[5] and that it will of course be restored by fires and waters and wild beasts' maws and birds' crops and the smaller intestines of fish and the gullet that belongs especially to times themselves?[6] Will it, however, be so much expected to be the same which perished, that men will return lame and one-eyed and leprous and palsied, that it will be no pleasure to revert to the former state? Or are they to return whole, so as to fear a recurrence of their suffering? What then of the concomitants of flesh? will everything be again

[1] The point here is that *cadauer* is derived from *cadere* (cf. *caducus* of the text).

[2] He means that as the corpse itself ultimately perishes and becomes nothing, there is then no word left to describe it.

[3] For this *quod* after verba sentiendi et declarandi, cf. Hoppe, p. 75.

[4] Tert. has a special fondness for substantives in *-tus* (cf. Hoppe, p. 124, n. 1).

[5] For the parallelism of clauses here, see Hoppe, p. 161, who gives a number of examples.

[6] Time itself is the great devourer, he means.

necessary to it and especially food and drink?[1] And must it breathe[2] with lungs and swell in its intestines[3] and refrain from shame with the organs of shame and work with all parts of the body? must it again become the victim of sores and wounds and fever and gouty feet? must death again be prayed for? To be sure, prayers for the recovery of flesh will end in the desire to escape again from it." And we too, it is true, said[4] the same things in a somewhat more honourable way, as the modesty of our book demanded.[5] But if you want to know to what lengths even their foul speech is permitted to go, you can make trial of it in meetings alike with heathen and with heretics.[6]

5. Therefore, since both the inexperienced and those whose wisdom is still confined to the thoughts of the crowd and the hesitating and the simple are disturbed afresh by these same thoughts, and everywhere this battering ram[7] is among the first to be adjusted against us, by which the state of the flesh is shattered,[8] of necessity the state of the flesh will first also be fortified by us,

[1] Hoppe (p. 115) regards *potaculum* as a coinage of Tert., designed to produce the alliteration with *pabulum* (cf. also his p. 152).

[2] A strange use of *natare*, attributed by Hoppe (p. 118) to the desire for clause parallelism.

[3] Tertullian is here thinking probably of gestation and lactation in women; cf. *Ad Uxor.*, I. 5, nulla in utero, nulla in uberibus aestuante sarcina nuptiarum.

[4] For the omission of the verb of saying, cf. Hoppe, p. 145.

[5] Tert. seems here to be referring to a passage in one of his earlier works.

[6] Hoppe (p. 158) counts twenty instances of this hexameter ending in Tertullian.

[7] On *aries* metaphorical, see Hoppe, p. 204, n. 1.

[8] On the word *quassare*, cf. Hoppe, p. 183, n. 1.

and blame be driven away by praise. Thus it is that the heretics challenge us to play[1] the rhetorician exactly in the same way as they also challenge us to act the philosopher. This poor little body, ineffectual and trivial,[2] which they do not shrink from calling even wicked, even if it had been the work[3] of angels, as is the opinion of Menander and Marcus,[4] even if it had been the building of some fiery creature, equally an angel, as Apelles teaches, the defence of it which a secondary divinity[5] furnished, would be sufficient to establish the authority of the flesh. Angels we know to come after[6] God. And now, whosoever that chief god of each heretic may be, I should not unjustly derive even from him the honour due to the flesh, from whom the will to bring it forth had shown itself. For assuredly he would have forbidden the creation of that which he had known was coming into being, if he had been against its creation. So also according to them as much as according to us, flesh is of God. There is no piece of work that belongs not to Him who allowed it to be. But it is well that the majority and all the

[1] For the final inf. after *prouocare*, cf. Hoppe, p. 43; for the thought of the passage, cf. d'Alès, p. 108.

[2] For the effective alliteration here, cf. Hoppe, p. 151, who compares Gell., xvi. 12, § 1.

[3] For *operatio* abstract = concrete, see Hoppe, p. 93.

[4] Hoppe (p. 151) seems to think that some effect is intended by the alliteration in *Menandro, Marco*. The opinion stated here is often condemned by Tertullian (d'Alès, pp. 110, 155). Menander is said to have been a pupil of Simon Magus, and one of the earliest Gnostics. Nothing seems to be known of Marcus.

[5] The angels here are spoken of as second only to God.

[6] For the "pregnant" *post*, see Hoppe, p. 141.

more famous systems of teaching resign the whole shaping of man to our God. How great He is, you who have believed in His singleness, know well enough. Begin now to be satisfied with the flesh whose Maker is so great. "But the universe also," you say, "is a work of God," and yet "the fashion of this world passeth away," as even the Apostle contends, but, because it is the work of God, the restoration of the universe will not therefore be believed in. And, to be sure, if the universe cannot be restored to its shape after death, what of a portion? Clearly, if a portion is made equal to the whole. For we appeal to the difference: at first, indeed, because "all things were made by" the word of God (and nothing without it was made),[1] and the flesh by the word of God came into being on account of that law, lest anything should come into being without word[2]—for he placed first in the forefront "Let us make man"—more also by hand on account of the preference, lest it should be compared to the totality: "and God," he said, "fashioned man." The method of creation is undoubtedly a matter of great difference in different cases, corresponding of course to the circumstances of things. For what was being created was less than he for whom it was being made, if indeed all this was being made for man to whom it was afterwards assigned by God. Rightly, therefore, all things came forth as servants, by order and

1 Cor. vii. 31

cf. John i. 3

Gen. i. 26

Gen. i. 27

[1] On the text of John i. 3, cf. d'Alès, p. 239.

[2] For the omission of *fieret*, unnecessarily perhaps supplied by Kroymann, see Hoppe, p. 145.

command and the mere power of a voice, but man,
cf. Gen. i. 26 on the contrary, as their lord, was built up for this end by God Himself that, being made by the Lord, he might be able to become a lord. Remember, moreover, that man is properly called flesh,
Gen. ii. 7 which first seized the name of man: "and God fashioned man, clay from the earth,"—now man, though hitherto clay,—"and breathed into his face
Gen. ii. 8 the breath of life, and man," that is, clay, "was made a living soul," "and God placed man, whom He made, in a park." So was man first a moulded thing, and thereafter complete. This I should show[1] for the reason that whatever was really planned and promised for man by God, you may know was due not only to the soul but also to the flesh, if not by sharing in kind, at least by the privilege of the name.[2]

6. I will therefore follow out the plan, if I can only claim as much for the flesh as He who made it conferred upon it, boasting as it was even then because that trifling thing,[3] clay, reached the hands of God, whatever they may be, quite happy enough though it was only touched. What if it had taken shape with no more trouble, immediately God had touched it! It was so great a thing that was accomplished, that was built up out of this material. Therefore it is honoured as often as it experiences

[1] For this perfect subjunctive, see Hoppe, p. 67, and for the sense of *commendare*, "bring forward," "present," "make plausible," see Hoppe, p. 127.

[2] On the ending, cf. the note at the end of c. 2.

[3] *pusillitas* = *res pusilla*, abstr. for concr., cf. Hoppe, p 92.

the hands of God, in being touched, plucked, drawn out, and shaped. Reflect that the entire Godhead has been taken possession of and surrendered to it, with hand, thought, work, plan, wisdom, forethought and especially with love itself, which drew the outlines.[1] For whatever clay was moulded into, was thought of as Christ, He who was to become man,[2] as clay also is, and "the Word" which was to "become flesh," even as earth also at that time was to be. For such is the first utterance of the Father to the Son: "Let us make man in our image and likeness. And God made man," namely that which He fashioned, "in the image of God He made him," namely the image of Christ. For the Word also is God, "who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be made equal to God."[3] So that clay, even then putting on the image of Christ who was to be in the flesh, was not only the work of God but also His pledge. What good does it do now, for the blackening of the origin of flesh, to air the name of earth, as a mean and humble element? since, even if another material had been suited to the chiselling out[4] of man, the glory of the Artificer should have been remembered, who in choosing it had judged it worthy, and likewise by handling it had made it so. The hand of Phidias creates the huge Olympian Jove out of ivory; it is worshipped,

cf. John i. 14

Gen. i. 26

Gen. i. 27

Phil. ii. 6

[1] On this description, see d'Alès, p. 64.
[2] On this passage, see d'Alès, pp. 108, 187, n. 2.
[3] On this and parallel passages, see d'Alès, p. 100.
[4] On *excudere*, metaph., see Hoppe, p. 187.

being no longer the tusk of a beast, and indeed of the most stupid[1] of beasts, but the greatest divinity in the world, not because the elephant, but because Phidias was so great:[2] would not the living and true God have cleansed any worthless material by His working, and healed it from every illness? or will this conclusion remain, that man fashioned God in a more honourable way than God fashioned man? As matters are, though clay is a stumbling-block, it is now something different. It is flesh I now grasp, not earth, though it is also
Gen. iii. 19 flesh that hears the words: "Earth thou art, and into earth thou shalt pass." It is the origin, not the nature that is under review. Existence is to be something better than its beginning and happier in the change. For gold also is earth, because it comes from the earth, but is only so far[3] earth as earth is the origin of gold, being a far different substance, brighter and grander, though from[4] a common source. So also God was permitted to drain the gold of flesh from the meanness, as you consider it, of clay, cleansing its original substance.[5]

7. But the authority of the flesh would seem to be weakened, because the divine hand did not

[1] The cunning of the elephant was unknown to Tertullian.

[2] Hoppe (p. 165) regards the assonance *elephantus*, *Phidias tantus* as intended for effect.

[3] *hactenus* = "not more," cf. Hoppe, p. 111.

[4] Hoppe (p. 33) takes this *de* as going with an ablative of comparison, and would translate, therefore, "brighter and grander than the common source."

[5] On this simile, see Hoppe, p. 216, who defines *excusato* as *purgato*, and *censu* as *originali materia*.

really handle it also in the way it handled clay. But since it handled clay with the intent that flesh should afterwards be produced out of the clay, it was of course for the flesh that it carried out its task. But further I should like you to learn when and how flesh bloomed out of clay. For it is wrong to maintain, as certain people [1] do, that the "garments made of skins" which Adam and Eve put on when they had been stripped of Paradise,[2] cf. Gen. iii. 21 are [3] themselves the new creation of flesh out of clay, seeing that somewhat earlier both Adam recognised an offshoot of his own substance in what was now the woman's flesh—"this is now Gen. ii. 23 bone of my bone and flesh of my flesh"—and the very portion transferred [4] from the male into the female was "filled up by flesh," whereas, I cf. Gen. ii. 21 fancy, if Adam had still been clay, it would have had to be filled up by clay. The clay was therefore wiped out and swallowed up in the flesh. When? when "man was made" by the breathing of Gen. ii. 7 God [5] "into a living soul," the breath being of course hot and capable of baking the clay somehow into another nature, into flesh as if into a jar. In the same way a potter also may re-embody clay in a stronger substance by a regulated blast of fire on it, and draw forth one form from another,

[1] The Valentinian Gnostics, who regarded the "garments" as flesh.

[2] On this so-called Greek accusative, see Hoppe, p. 17.

[3] On the "potential" use of the future, see Hoppe, p. 65.

[4] For the use of the abstract form in the sense of the concrete, cf. Hoppe, p. 93; see also p. 120.

[5] Cf. d'Alès, p. 108.

more suitable than the original one and now with a class and name of its own. For even if it is written: "Will the clay say to the potter?" that is, man to God; and even if the Apostle says: "in earthen vessels," man is clay, because he was previously mud, and flesh is a vessel, because it was produced from mud through the heat of the divine breath. It was this flesh that was afterwards clad in "the garments of skin," namely in the skins drawn over it. It is actually true that if you withdraw the skin, you will bare the flesh. So what to-day becomes a "spoil," if it be removed, was a dress when it was a superstructure. Thus also the Apostle, by calling "circumcision the stripping off of the flesh," affirmed that the skin was a garment. This being so, you have both the clay made glorious by the hand of God, and the flesh made yet more glorious by the breath of God, by which the flesh laid aside the crude state of mud and took on the adornments of the soul. Are you more careful than God, and do you indeed mount Scythian and Indian jewels and pure white grains[1] from the Red Sea not on lead, not on bronze, not on iron, not even[2] on silver, but insert them in the choicest and, besides, the most elaborately worked gold, and first ensure the fitness of vessels by the use of all costly ointments, just as when you have swords of the approved blue colour you give them

Isa. xxix. 16. etc.; Rom. ix. 20
2 Cor. iv. 7
cf. Gen. iii. 21
cf. Col. ii. 11

[1] He means of course "pearls."
[2] For *ne—quoque* = *ne—quidem*, see Hoppe, p. 107.

scabbards equal to them in worthiness[1]—but God entrusted the shadow of His soul, the wind of His breath, the work of His mouth to some worthless sheath, and by giving it an unworthy position, of course condemned it?[2] And place it He did—or did He rather insert it in, and mingle it with flesh? So great indeed was the mixture that it can be held uncertain whether[3] it is flesh that carries about soul, or soul that carries about flesh, whether[3] flesh is in attendance on soul or soul in attendance on flesh. But even if it is rather to be believed that soul holds the reins and is master, as being nearer to God, even this redounds to the glory of the flesh, because it both holds together that which is next to God, and shows its command of its very power. For on what natural advantage, what secular profit, what savour of the elements does the soul feed without the help of the flesh? What else could you expect? It is through it that it is supported by every tool of the senses, sight, hearing, taste, smell, touch. Through it it is sprinkled with divine power, and it accomplishes everything by means of speech, even if it be only a silent harbinger. For even speech comes from an instrument of flesh, accomplishments need the vehicle of flesh, as do pursuits, talents, and works, businesses, functions; the whole life[4] of the soul is bound up with the flesh[5]

[1] For the use of abstr. nouns where the corresponding adjectives might have been expected, cf. Hoppe, p. 86.
[2] On this simile, see Hoppe, p. 216.
[3] On *utrumne—an*, cf. Hoppe, p. 73.
[4] On this substantival use of the infin., see Hoppe, p. 42.
[5] On this thought, cf. d'Alès, p. 141.

to such a degree that cessation of life for the soul means nothing else but a departure from the flesh. So even death itself[1] belongs to the flesh, as does life also. Further, if all things are in subjection to the soul through the flesh, they are in subjection to the flesh also. When you make use of a thing, you must at the same time make use of the instrument which enables you to use it. So the flesh, while it is considered attendant and handmaid to the soul, is found to be also its partner and joint heir. And if of temporal things,[2] why not also of everlasting?[2]

8. This indeed, as it were with reference to the general character of human circumstances, I should pay heed to,[3] as a help to the flesh. Let us consider now with reference also to the special character of the Christian name how great a privilege before God this trifling and mean substance enjoys, although it would have sufficed for it that no soul at all could gain salvation unless it believed while it was in the flesh; to such a degree is flesh the pivot[4] of salvation. When as the result of salvation the soul is bound to God, it is the flesh itself that brings about this possibility. To be sure the flesh is cleansed[5] that the soul may be freed from stain: the flesh is anointed that the soul may be

[1] On this substantival use of the infin., see Hoppe, p. 42.
[2] For the neut. pl. of adj. as substantive, cf. Hoppe, p. 97.
[3] On this perfect subjunctive, cf. Hoppe, p. 67.
[4] On the play upon words in *caro*, *cardo*, cf. Hoppe, p. 169.
[5] Oehler compares *De Baptismo*, cc. 6–8, for the five stages here enumerated.

consecrated; the flesh is marked[1] that the soul also may be fortified; the flesh is shadowed by the laying on of a hand, that the spirit also may be enlightened by the Spirit;[2] the flesh feeds on the body and blood of Christ, that the soul also may be fed[3] from God.[4] Therefore they that are joined in work cannot be treated differently from one another in payment. Even the sacrifices that are pleasing to God, I mean the soul struggles, fastings, and dry[5] foods, and the squalor attaching to this duty, are celebrated by the flesh at special discomfort to itself. Virginity also and widowhood and an orderly neglect of marriage in secret and the one[6] knowledge of it are offered to God from among the good things of the flesh. Again, what do you think about it, when for loyalty to the name it is dragged out into public view and exposed to the hatred of the people, while it struggles with determination; when in prisons it wastes away, a victim to the foulest deprivation of light, to the lack of human society, to filth, noisomeness, insult; denied freedom even in sleep, nay chained even to its very bed and rent by the very pallet; when now in daylight also it is torn by

cf. Matt. xx. 1–16

[1] With the sign of the Cross.

[2] See d'Alès, pp. 327, n. 1, 368.

[3] On the metaph. use of *saginare*, "to fatten," cf. Hoppe, p. 181.

[4] This elaborate parallelism is affected by Tertullian; cf. Hoppe, p. 161.

[5] In my view the true text is simply *seras* (*i.e.* ξηρὰς), *escas*, *et aridas* being a gloss defining the Graeco-Latin word *seras*. The reference is to what is called *xerophagia* (Tert., *De Ieiun.*, i. 5, Cassian).

[6] Through marriage with *one* person alone.

every contrivance of torture; when finally it is squandered away[1] by execution, striving to repay Christ by dying for Him, and indeed often by the same cross, nay even by more cruelly contrived penalties as well? Verily that is most blest and glorious which can meet such a debt before Christ the Lord, as to owe nothing more to Him than its deliverance from indebtedness to Him, being all the more enchained because liberated![2]

9. So, to tell again[3] of what God with His own hands built in the image of God, what He endowed with life from His own breath "in the likeness" of His own vital force, what He set over the habitation, profit and lordship of all His workmanship,[4] what He clothed with His own sacraments[5] and trainings, whose cleanness[6] He loves, whose chastisements He approves, whose sufferings He counts as paid to Himself, will *it* not rise again, though God's again and again?[7] Away, away with the idea[8] that God should abandon to eternal ruin the work of His hands, the object of His mind's care, the receptacle[9] of

cf. Gen. i. 26

[1] *Erogare*, "to spend," hence "to put an end to," "to kill"; see Hoppe, p. 131.

[2] See d'Alès, p. 108.

[3] For this poetical sense of *retexere*, "to repeat," cf. Hoppe, p. 192.

[4] For the use of abstr. for concr., cf. Hoppe, p. 93.

[5] On the sense of the word, see d'Alès, p. 323, de Backer, *Sacramentum* (Louvain, 1911), pp. 58 f.

[6] For the plural of the abstract noun, cf. Hoppe, p. 90.

[7] For the avoidance of the relative clause, *totiens dei* being equal to *quæ totiens dei est*, cf. Hoppe, p. 142.

[8] For the construction *absit ut*, see Hoppe, p. 82.

[9] Literally "sheath"; cf. Hoppe, p. 117. For the rime between *uaginam* and *reginam*, see Hoppe, p. 165.

His breath, the queen of His effort, the heir of His bounty, the priest of His worship, the soldier of His witness, the sister of His Christ. We know that "God is good": it is from His Christ that we learn "He alone is good," and as, after commanding love to Himself, He then commands "love to one's neighbour," He himself also will do that which He commanded. He will love flesh, which is in so many ways neighbour to Him; though it be weak, yet "is strength made perfect in weakness"; though ailing, yet "none need a physician save those that are in a bad way"; though without honour, yet "them that are without honour we compass with the greater honour"; though lost, yet "I came," said He, "to rescue that which was lost"; though apt to sin, yet "I," said He, "prefer for myself the salvation rather than the death of a sinner"; though condemned, yet "I," said He, "shall strike dead and make whole."[1] Why do you reproach the flesh with that which waits for God and rests its hopes on God? Those whom He has aided are honoured by Him. I should venture to say: if the flesh had not had those experiences, the kindness, favour, mercy, yea, all the beneficent power of God would have been of none effect.[2]

Matt. xix. 17 cf. Matt. xix. 19; xxii. 37, 39

2 Cor. xii. 9

Luke v. 31

1 Cor. xii. 23

Luke xix. 10 Deut. xxxii. 39 cf. Ezek. xviii. 23, 32

10. You have now heard the passages of Scripture by which the flesh is blackened:[3] heed also

[1] For the anaphora throughout this passage, cf. Hoppe, p. 147.

[2] *uacuisset* is a byform of *uacauisset*. For such late forms see Georges, *Wörterbuch*, s. v. *vaco*.

[3] For *infuscare* thus used = "blame," cf. Hoppe, p. 133; and for the play on words, cf. Hoppe, p. 169.

those by which it is made to shine; you are reading the passages wherein it is degraded, direct your vision also to those in which it is
Isa. xl. 6 raised.[1] "All flesh is hay." That is not all that Isaiah declares, but he says also: "All flesh
Isa. xl. 5 shall see God's salvation." God is recorded in Genesis as saying: "My Spirit shall not remain
Gen. vi. 3 in these men, because they are flesh." But we
Joel ii. 28 (iii. 1) also hear His voice through Joel: "I will pour out of my Spirit on all flesh." Besides, you must not take your knowledge of the Apostle from one type of passage[2] only, in which he frequently pierces
cf. Rom. vii. 18 Rom. viii. 8 the flesh. For although he denies that "any good dwells in his flesh," although he avers that "those who are in the flesh, cannot please God," because
Gal. v. 17 it "lusts against the spirit," and even if other statements are to be found in him in which, not indeed the nature, but the behaviour of the flesh
c. 16 is dishonoured, we shall certainly say elsewhere that no reproach ought to be brought against the flesh in particular except with a view to the chastisement of the soul, which subdues the flesh in service to itself; but sometimes the voice of Paul is heard also in those letters, telling us that he
Gal. vi. 17 "bears the brands of Christ on his body," forbidding the pollution of our "body," since it is
cf. 1 Cor. vi. 19 "the temple" of "God," representing our "bodies
1 Cor. vi. 15 as Christ's members," advising us "to carry and
cf. 1 Cor. vi. 20 glorify God in our body." Therefore, if the blots

[1] On this chapter, see d'Alès, p. 108.
[2] For *stilus* = "passage," cf. Hoppe, p. 123.

upon the flesh make its resurrection utterly impossible, why will not its excellences rather bring it about? It is more in agreement with God's character to restore to a state of salvation what He has for a time rejected, than to consign to utter ruin what He has actually approved.

11. Enough touching the praise[1] of the flesh, in opposition to its enemies and its friends alike. None lives so carnally as those that deny the resurrection of the flesh. For those that deny it view punishment and training with contempt. Concerning them the Paraclete also speaks plainly through the prophetess Prisca: "Flesh they are, and flesh they hate."[2] If it be fortified by influence great enough to defend it and earn it salvation, ought we to review the dominion and power[3] and freedom of action even of God Himself, to see whether He is great enough to be able "to rebuild" and re-establish "the tabernacle" of flesh, broken down and swallowed up[4] and snatched away in whatsoever ways it may be? Or has He also published for us some instances of this power of His publicly over nature?

cf. Acts xv. 16; Tob. xiii. 12, etc. cf. 2 Cor. v. 4, etc.

[1] For *praeconium* in the sense of "praise," cf. Hoppe, p. 123.

[2] Intentional play upon words here; it means: "They live in a fleshly way, that is, in sin: and yet hate the flesh in denying its resurrection" (Hoppe, p. 171). See also d'Alès, p. 109, and for a collection of such Montanist oracles, d'Alès, p. 452. The Clairvaux MS. omits this sentence altogether.

[3] For the alliteration in *potentiam, potestatem*, cf. Hoppe, p. 152.

[4] For the alliteration in *dilapsum, deuoratum*, cf. Hoppe, p. 150.

Lest perchance any should know[1] in the future[2] how to know God, who must be believed on no other condition than that He should be believed[3] able to do anything, you can clearly find statements in the philosophers who claim that this universe was not unborn and uncreated. But what is much better, almost all heresies, agreeing that the universe came into being and was made, attribute creation[4] to our God.[5] Therefore be sure that He produced all that we see out of nothing, and you know God in trusting[6] that God has such power.[7] For there are also certain people, too weak to believe[8] that at first, who maintain that the universe was instituted by Him, as the philosophers say, rather from underlying matter.[9] However, even if it were really[10] so, since nevertheless He was said to have produced, as the result of the reshaping of matter, natures and forms that were far different from what the matter itself had been, I should none the less

[1] The variant reading *sitiant*, "thirst," with the dependent infin., is alluded to by Hoppe, p. 47.

[2] Hoppe takes *adhuc* of the future, and explains *ne—adhuc* as equal to *non* (*ne*)*—iam* (p. 110).

[3] For this classical construction with the passive of *credo*, see Hoppe, p. 52.

[4] For *conditio* (abstr.) = concr., cf. Hoppe, p. 92.

[5] See d'Alès, p. 106.

[6] For the modal abl. of gerund = pres. participle, cf. Hoppe, p. 57.

[7] For this *quod* construction, cf. c. 4 and Hoppe, p. 75.

[8] For *infirmus* with the infin., cf. Hoppe, p. 49.

[9] The ὕλη ὑποκειμένη of Aristotle.

[10] For the adverbial phrase *in uero*, cf. Hoppe, p. 100, also *Apol.*, 23 (p. 80, l. 5, ed. Mayor), according to the true reading of codex Fuldensis: see Löfstedt, *Tert. Apol. textkr. untersucht*, pp. 99 ff.

maintain that He had produced them from nothing, if He had produced those things that had not existed at all. For what difference does it make whether anything is produced from nothing or from something, provided that it becomes what it was not, since also not to have existed is to have been nothing?[1] So also, on the contrary,[2] to have been is to have been something. Now, although there is a difference, yet both support my opinion. For whether God achieved everything out of nothing, He will be able to fashion flesh also from nothing, flesh that is reduced[3] to nothing: or whether He gave them form out of different matter, He will be able to call forth from something else flesh by whatsoever absorbed.[4] And assuredly He who made is able[5] to remake; just as it is much more to make than to remake, to make a beginning than to restore a beginning, so also you must believe that the restoration of flesh is easier than its creation.[6]

12. Look now also at the very examples of the divine power. Day dies into night and is everywhere buried by darkness. The glory of the

[1] On all this passage, see d'Alès, pp. 111 f.

[2] On the phrase *e contrario*, see Hoppe, p. 102.

[3] Read *prodactam* (from *prodigere*) with Oehler and Löfstedt, *Kritische Bemerkungen zu Tertullians Apologetikum* (Lund, 1918), p. 55. This is confirmed by the Clairvaux MS.

[4] *Dehauire* properly means "to draw water, hence" "to swallow, absorb, waste" (Hoppe, p. 128); *quocumque* is probably adv. here, "whithersoever."

[5] For *idoneus* with the infin., see Hoppe, p. 49.

[6] For the ending, cf. Hoppe, p. 156.

universe is shrouded in gloom, everything is blackened. All things are bemoaned, silenced, paralysed,[1] everywhere there is a stoppage of work. Thus is the loss of light mourned.[2] And yet back it comes to life again for the whole world with its outfit, with its dowry, with the sun, being whole and unimpaired, putting to death[3] its own slayer[4] which is night, tearing open its own burial place which is darkness, appearing as heir to itself, until night also come to life again, it being likewise accompanied by its own equipment. For the rays of the stars which the morning light had put out are re-ignited; the absent constellations,[5] too, which a difference in season had removed, are brought back; the mirror-like moons also, which the progress of the month had worn away, are repaired. Winters and summers, springs[6] and autumns come back again[7] in their courses with their strength, characteristics and fruits. Nay more, even the earth gets its training from the sky: the clothing of the trees after they have been stript, the colouring of the flowers anew, the spreading again of the grass, the display of

[1] For the triple alliteration, *sordent, silent, stupent*, cf. Hoppe, p. 148.

[2] For the figura pseudo-etymologica in *lux-lugetur*, an error of taste of which Tert. is not often guilty, cf. Hoppe, p. 172.

[3] For the (poetical) use of *interficere* with an impersonal object, cf. Hoppe, p. 182.

[4] For this metonymical sense of *mors*, see Hoppe, p. 94.

[5] For *siderum absentiae = sidera absentia*, and such-like phrases, see Hoppe, p. 86; for the plural of the abstract noun, see Hoppe, p. 88.

[6] For *uerna*, neut. pl. of adj., thus used, cf. Hoppe, p. 98, n.

[7] For this sense of *reuolui*, see Hoppe, p. 191.

the identical seeds that have been wasted, and the fact that this does not happen till they have been wasted. A wondrous plan! it is first a cheat, then a preserver;[1] it kills that it may give back; it destroys that it may keep; it corrupts that it may renew; it first breaks up that it may actually enlarge. Since[2] it restores them in a more fertile and cultivated state than they were when they were destroyed, destruction may truly be said to have meant increase, harm profit, and loss gain. Let me say it[3] once for all[4]: Every creation is subject to recurrence. Everything you meet had a previous existence: whatever you have lost will come again. Everything comes a second time: all things return to a settled position when they have gone away, all things begin when they have ceased to be. They are brought to an end in order that they may come into being:[5] nothing is lost except that it may be recovered.[6] All this revolving order of things, therefore, is evidence of the resurrection of the dead. God ordained it in works before He commanded it in writing, He proclaimed it by strength before He proclaimed it in words.[7] He first sent you nature as teacher, intending to send you prophecy also, in order that

[1] For the omission of *fit*, cf. Hoppe, p. 145.
[2] *Si quidem* in causal sense, cf. Hoppe, p. 83.
[3] For this perfect subjunctive, used as "potential," see Hoppe, p. 67.
[4] For this sense of *semel*, see Hoppe, p. 113.
[5] For the alliteration, *finiuntur, fiant*, cf. Hoppe, p. 148.
[6] For this "final" use of *in* and the accusative, cf. Hoppe, p. 39.
[7] For the play upon words in *uiribus, uocibus*, cf. Hoppe, p. 169.

having learnt from nature, you may the more easily believe prophecy, in order that you may receive at once when you hear what you have already seen everywhere, and that you may not doubt God to be the resuscitator[1] of flesh also,[2] since you know Him to be the restorer of all things. And, to be sure, if all things rise again for man for whom they have been arranged, it follows that this cannot be for man unless for flesh also, and therefore it is absurd to conclude that the thing itself should perish entirely, on whose account and for whom nothing perishes.[3]

13. If the universe does not portray resurrection, if creation[4] indicates no such character, because its individual parts are said not so much to die as to come to an end, and are not regarded as re-endowed with life,[5] but given a new shape, take a sufficient and undeniable example of this hope, since[6] it is a breathing thing, subject both to life and to death: I mean that bird, special to the east,[7] famous from its solitary[8] character, miraculous in its after-history,[9] which gladly puts itself

[1] *Resuscitator*, according to Hoppe (p. 116), was coined by Tert. for parallelism with *restitutor*. For the combination of alliteration and rime in this case, see Hoppe, p. 167.

[2] For *non dubitare* with acc. and infin., cf. Hoppe, p. 51.

[3] For this ending, cf. c. 2, and Hoppe, p. 157.

[4] For *conditio* abstr. for concr., cf., c. 11 and Hoppe, p. 92.

[5] The new coinage *redanimari* (*reanimari*) for the sake of alliteration with *reformari* (cf. Hoppe, pp. 115, 153).

[6] *Si quidem* = "since," cf. c. 12, and Hoppe, p. 83.

[7] For *peculiaris* with the genitive, cf. Hoppe, p. 23.

[8] Or perhaps "unique": there is only one at a time.

[9] For *de* with abl. of cause, twice here, cf. Hoppe, p. 33; for the double rime, Hoppe, p. 165.

to death and renews itself, passing away and appearing again[1] by a death which is a birth, a second time a phœnix where now there is none, a second time the very creature that no longer exists, another and yet the same.[2] What could be clearer and more definite for our purpose? Of what else is there such a proof? Even God in his Scriptures says: "And thou shalt surely flourish as doth the phœnix,"[3] that is from[4] its death, from its funeral, so that you may believe that even out of fire[5] the nature of its body can be driven. The Lord declared that we "are better than many sparrows": if not also "than many phœnixes," it is nothing great. But shall men perish once for all,[6] while Arabian birds are sure of rising again?[7] Ps. xci. 13 Matt. x. 31

14. Since meantime such are the outlines of divine strength that God has no less worked in parables than spoken, let us come also to his very edicts and decrees, by which at this very moment we are arranging the present division of our subject-matter: for we began with the authority of the flesh, considering whether it is in its ruined

[1] For the rime *decedens, succedens*, cf. Hoppe, p. 163.
[2] For the careful structure of this sentence, cf. Hoppe, p. 161.
[3] Tertullian makes a curious error here; the φοῖνιξ referred to in the psalm is the "palm tree"; cf. d'Alès, p. 251. The natural history of that age was elementary (cf. d'Alès, p. 496).
[4] For *de* where we should expect *ab*, cf. Hoppe, p. 38.
[5] For *de* with abl. of separation, cf. Hoppe, p. 34.
[6] On *semel* = "once for all," cf. Hoppe, p. 113.
[7] For this abl. absol. see Hoppe, p. 32, and for *de* with abl. construction with *securus*, cf. Hoppe, p. 34. A. Souter, *Study of Ambrosiaster*, p. 137, *Vocabularium Iurisprudentiae Romanae*, V. 303, 17 ff. For the ending of this chapter, cf. c. 1 and Hoppe, p. 156.

state capable of salvation, then we went on to ask with regard to God's power, whether it is great enough to be able to confer salvation on a ruined object; now, if we have proved both these points, I should like also to enquire with regard to the cause, whether there is one worthy enough to claim the resurrection of the flesh as necessary and as certainly in every way reasonable, because it is natural to say: "even if flesh can[1] be restored, even if the Godhead is able[2] to restore it, yet[3] there will have to be[4] a reason for that restitution." Listen, therefore, also to the reason, you who learn in God's presence that He is as good as He is also just, good in His own nature, just in His relation to ours. For if man had not sinned, he would know merely that God was good by the very individuality of His nature. But now he experiences also His justice as the result of the necessity of the situation, and yet in this very thing is His goodness also shown, namely that He is also just. Both by helping the good and by punishing the evil He shows His justice and thus gives a double vote for the good, as on the one hand he punishes the latter, and on the other he rewards the former.[5] But with Marcion[6] you will learn more fully

[1] On *capax* with the infin., see Hoppe, p. 49.
[2] On *idoneus* with the genitive, see Hoppe, pp. 22, 55.
[3] On *sed* introducing the apodosis, with *etsi* in the protasis, see Hoppe, p. 108.
[4] On *praeesse* = "vorhanden sein," see Hoppe, p. 136.
[5] On the contrast *istud-illud*, corresponding to the classical *hoc-illud*, cf. Hoppe, p. 104.
[6] A reference to *Aduersus Marcionem*, I, II.

whether this is all that is in the Godhead. Meantime such is *our* God, deservedly a judge, because He is our Lord and master, deservedly a Lord because He is our creator, deservedly a creator because He is our God. Hence[1] it is that some heretic or other reasoned: "deservedly He is no judge, for He is no Lord; deservedly no Lord, for He is no creator." I do not know really whether[2] He be a god who is not also a creator as God is, nor a Lord as our Creator is. Therefore if it is most fitting for a God and Lord and Creator to fix a judgment for man on this very point, whether he has taken care to recognise and pay court to His own Lord and creator or not,[3] resurrection will of course fulfil that judgment. This will be the whole reason, or rather the necessity for resurrection, a reason of course entirely in keeping with God, the purposer[4] of the judgment. With regard to His arrangement you ought to consider whether the divine judgment presides over the judging of both elements in human nature, the soul as much as the flesh. It will be fitting that what it is suitable to judge should also be raised again. We say that God's judgment must in the first instance be believed to be full and complete, as it is then final and thence lasting, as also just, since in no case

[1] On *hinc* as inferential particle, see Hoppe, p. 111.
[2] On *si* = *num*, cf. Hoppe, p. 73.
[3] On the double *an* (poetical and post-classical), cf. Hoppe, pp. 73 f.
[4] Kroymann's *destinatori;* but the *destinatio* of the MSS. is rather confirmed by *Apol.* 48 (p. 136, l. 17, ed. Mayor), *ratio restitutionis destinatio iudicii est.*

does it fall short of this, as also worthy of God, since in accordance with His long-suffering it is full and complete.[1] Therefore the fullness and completeness of the judgment depends only on the presentation[2] of the whole man. The whole man, further, shows himself to be[3] from the combined growth of two natures, and therefore he must be displayed in both natures, who must be judged as a whole, since he did not of course live except as a whole. As therefore he has lived, so will he be judged, because he must be judged by his life. For life is the cause of judgment, and it has to be fulfilled[4] in as many natures as those in which it died.[5]

15. Come then! let our opponents sever the composite structure of flesh and soul first in the conduct of life, that thus they may dare to sever it also in the sphere of life's reward. Let them repudiate the partnership in works, that they may rightly be able to repudiate the share in rewards also. Let not the flesh share in the sentence, if it is not also to blame. Let the soul alone be recalled, if the soul alone dies. But in truth it no more dies alone than it has passed alone through the course from which it withdraws, I mean the present life. So far is the soul from passing through life alone that we do not even withdraw thoughts from the

[1] On the alliteration, *plenum, perfectum*, cf. Hoppe, p. 152.
[2] For the sense of *repraesentatio*, see d'Alès, pp. 358 f.
[3] On *parere* = *apparere*, see Hoppe, p. 139, n. 1.
[4] On this sense of *dispungo*, see Hoppe, p. 130.
[5] On the ending, cf. c. 1 and see Hoppe, p. 156.

partnership of the flesh, although they are alone, although they are not brought to their result through the flesh, since what is done in the mind is the action of the soul in, and with, and through the flesh. This aspect of the flesh as citadel of the soul is attacked by the Lord also when He is trouncing the thoughts: "Why think you in your hearts what is wicked?" and: "He who hath gazed upon to desire, hath already in his heart corrupted."[1] To such a degree is the act of the flesh apart alike from the working and the result of thought. But even if the ruling principle of the senses has been dedicated[2] in the brain or in the middle between the eyebrows, or wherever the philosophers are pleased to place it, I mean what is called the *hēgĕmonicon*,[3] every place of thought[4] in the soul will be flesh The soul is never apart from the flesh, as long as it is in the flesh. Everything acts along with that apart from which it does not exist. Inquire further[5] whether even thoughts are administered by the flesh, since it is through the flesh that they become outwardly known. If the soul is revolving something, the face produces a sign,

Matt. ix. 4
Matt. v. 28

[1] Here Tertullian, in revolt from allegorical interpretation, is straining the metaphorical language beyond what it can bear (cf. d'Alès, pp. 249 f.).

[2] D'Alès considers the exact force of *consecrare* on pp. 367 f.

[3] This is the Greek word which he translates above by *principalitas*. Cf. especially *De Anima*, c. 15, and Usener, *Epicurea*, § 312, p. 217.

[4] Apparently a translation of the Greek φροντιστήριον (see *Thesaurus*).

[5] For *adhuc* = *insuper*, *praeterea*, see Hoppe, p. 110.

the face is the mirror[1] of all strivings.[2] Let them refuse partnership in deeds to that to which they cannot refuse partnership in thoughts.[3] They indeed count up the failings of the flesh against it; therefore, being sinful, it will be kept for punishment. We indeed face it with the excellences of the flesh; therefore also when it has worked well it will be kept for reward. And if it is the soul that leads and drives into everything, it is the flesh that obeys. God may not be believed to be either an unjust or an inactive judge; unjust, if he debar from rewards the partner in good works, inactive, if he separate from punishment the partner in evil works, since human judgment is regarded as all the more perfect in that it demands for justice even the tools of every deed, showing them neither mercy nor grudge to prevent them from sharing the result either in punishment or in favour with the promoters of the deed.[4]

16. But although we have assigned rule to the soul and obedience to the flesh, we have to take precaution lest they overturn that too by another process of reasoning, in such a manner as to wish to put the flesh at the service of the soul in another way, not as a handmaid, lest they be compelled to recognise it also as a partner. For they will say that servants and partners have the choice of

[1] On this metaphor, see Hoppe, p. 214.

[2] For this paratactic construction, where the protasis is expressed without the conditional particle, cf. Hoppe, p. 83.

[3] For the rime between *factorum* and *cogitatorum*, cf. Hoppe, p. 165.

[4] For the ending, cf. c. 1 and Hoppe, p. 156.

service and partnership, and power over their own will in both directions, being themselves also men; that therefore they share deserts with the originators to whom they have voluntarily lent their services; and that flesh which has no intelligence or feeling in itself, and has no willingness or unwillingness of its own, is rather in attendance on the soul like a vessel, as a tool, not as a servant.[1] That therefore the judge sits in judgment over the soul only, judging how it has employed the vessel of the flesh, but that the vessel itself is not liable to sentence, any more than the cup is condemned if some one have put poison in it, or the sword is sentenced to fight with wild beasts, if some one has worked[2] murder on the highway with it. Thus then the flesh will be innocent in so far as evil works will not be reckoned against it, and there is nothing to prevent its salvation under the plea of innocence. For although neither good nor evil works are attributed to it, yet it is more becoming to the divine kindness to save the innocent. It is its duty to save well-doers: but it is a very good man who offers even what is not due. And yet, I ask you, would you give less condemnation to a cup—I do not say, a poisoned cup into which some dying person[3] has vomited,[4] but—one stained by

[1] For *ministerium* = *ministrum*, cf. *ministeriis*, the true reading in *Apol.* 39 (p. 110, l. 30, ed. Mayor), (Löfstedt, *Krit. Bemerk. z. Tert. Apol.*, p. 82).

[2] For the periphrastic *fuerit operatus*, cf. Hoppe, p. 60.

[3] For *mors* = *moriens*, cf. Hoppe, p. 94.

[4] This may practically mean "expired with a yawn."

the breath of a courtesan or a high-priest of Cybele or a gladiator or an executioner, than to the kisses of these people themselves? Even one that we have ourselves befouled and beclouded[1] or that has not been mixed to our liking, it is our habit to smash, to show the greater anger with our slave. As for a sword that is imbrued[2] in highway robberies, who will not banish[3] it from his whole house, not to speak of his chamber or his pillow, taking the view, of course, that he would dream of nothing else than the reproaches of souls that are pressing on and disturbing the bedfellow of their own blood?[4] But in truth the cup that has a good conscience[5] and is commended by the care of the waiter, will acquire adornment even from the garlands of the heavy drinker, or will be honoured by the sprinkling of flowers upon it, and the sword that was nobly stained in battle and is better than a homicide will deem its merits worthy of dedication to a god. Is it possible[6] therefore so to inflict a sentence both on vessels and on tools that they too may share in[7] the deserts of their owners and authors? thus I shall have met

[1] *nubilus* = *sordidus*, "turbid," is poetical (Hoppe, p. 179).
[2] On the personification in *ebrius*, see Hoppe, p. 179.
[3] *relegabit*: see Oehler's apparatus; Kroymann's *religabit*, with no critical note, is surely a misprint.
[4] As the sword and the blood on it are in bed together, the sword is spoken of as the bedfellow of the blood with which it is stained.
[5] A very striking expression for a cup that has never been used for the mixing of poison (cf. Hoppe, p. 179).
[6] On *est* with the infin., cf. c. 3 and Hoppe, p. 47.
[7] On *communicare* with the dative in this sense, see Hoppe, p. 28.

even that kind of reasoning, although the difference of the subject fails to furnish a real illustration. For every vessel or tool comes into use from elsewhere, being a substance entirely alien to the nature of man; but flesh, having been from its beginning in the womb conceived, shaped and begotten together with the soul, is also mingled with it in all its working. For, although it is called a "vessel" in the writings of the Apostle, who commands us to deal with it "honourably," yet it is also called by him "the outer man," I mean the clay, which was first engraved with the title "man," not "cup" or "sword" or any vessel It was called "vessel" because[1] of its power to hold, that by which it contains and holds together the soul, but "man" because it shares the nature which shows it to be in its workings not a tool, but a servant. So also the servant will be held to judgment, although of itself it has no intelligence, because it is a part of that which has intelligence, and is not a mere chattel. This also the Apostle says, knowing that the flesh does nothing of itself that is not to be attributed to the soul: nevertheless he judges the flesh to be sinful, lest because it seems to be urged on by the soul, it should be believed to be freed from judgment. So also when he enjoins on the flesh some works of merit, he says: "Glorify, carry God in your body," knowing well that these efforts also are due to the soul's impulse. The

1 Thess. iv. 4

cf. 2 Cor. iv. 16

cf. Rom. viii. 3

cf. Rom. viii. 1

1 Cor. vi. 20

[1] On the abl. *nomine* (= *causā*) with a genitive, cf. Hoppe, p. 30.

reason, however, why he demands them from the flesh also, is this: reward is promised to it also. Otherwise, neither would reproach have been fittingly inflicted on what was removed from blame, nor exhortation have been suitably addressed to what it shut out from[1] glory: for both reproach and exhortation would have no place[2] in regard to the flesh, if the reward which is the prize of resurrection did not exist.[2]

17. Every unsophisticated supporter of our view will imagine that the flesh, also, must be brought face to face[3] with judgment for the reason that the soul cannot otherwise experience torture or comfort, seeing that it is incorporeal. This is indeed the view of the crowd. But that the soul is corporeal we both proclaim here and have proved in the book dealing with it,[4] having a special kind of solidity by which it can both feel and experience something. For that even now souls are tortured and soothed in the world below, although unbodied, although exiles also from the flesh, may be proved[5] by the case of Lazarus.[6]

De Anima 5 ff.

cf. Luke xvi. 23–26

[1] On *extraneus* with the genitive, cf. Hoppe, p. 22; contrast the use with *a* earlier in the chapter (cf. Hoppe, pp. 22, n., 36).

[2] On *uacare*, "to be purposeless," "not to exist," cf. Hoppe, pp. 139 f.; Mayor on *Apol.*, 1, p. 2, l. 24; 11, p. 40, l. 29. On the ending, cf. c. 1 and Hoppe, p. 156.

[3] On the meaning of *repraesentare*, see d'Alès, pp. 356 ff.

[4] That is, the *De Anima*.

[5] The fut. indic. where we might expect the "potential"; cf. Hoppe, p. 65.

[6] There is a strong probability that Tertullian said *Eleazarus* or *Elazarus*, though, judging by Kroymann's silence, the MSS. have failed to preserve any trace of this. This suggestion of mine is confirmed by the Clairvaux MS.

I have therefore permitted[1] my opponent to say: Consequently that which has a bodily nature[2] of its own, will of itself[3] have sufficient power both to experience and to feel, so that it will not need to be presented[4] in the flesh. Nay rather, its need will extend so far, not that it will not be able to feel anything without the flesh, but that it must feel also along with the flesh. For as much as it is able to act of itself, so much also will it be able to be acted upon. But to act it is not able of itself. Of itself it is able only to think, to will, to desire, to arrange, but for accomplishment it waits for the help of the flesh. So therefore it demands the partnership of the flesh also for experience, that it may be able to experience as fully through it as without it it could not fully act. And therefore it meantime endures the sentence against those things, the accomplishment of which it is able of itself to achieve, I mean of desire and thought and will. Further, if these were enough for fullness of rewards, so that deeds would not be also sought for, the soul would be entirely equal to the task of facing a final judgment, as it is to be judged touching those things, to the performance of which it had by itself been equal. Since,

[1] *Dare* with the infin. is an especially poetical construction; cf. Hoppe, p. 43.

[2] *Corpulentia* in this sense; cf. Hoppe, p. 120.

[3] *De suo*, "without the co-operation of another," cf. Hoppe, p. 103; compare also *in suo* (neut.), "in its own kind," which occurs three times in Pseudo-Aug. (= Ambst) *Quaest.* (see my index).

[4] On the meaning of *repraesentatio*, see d'Alès, pp. 358 f.

however, deeds also are linked to deserts, and deeds are performed by the flesh, it is no longer satisfactory that the soul should apart from the flesh be either cherished or tortured for what were also the works of the flesh. Although it has a body, although it has limbs, they are as little able to help it to feel as they are also to help it to act perfectly. Therefore it is in the measure in which it has acted, that it also suffers in the world below, being the first to taste judgment, even as it was the first to assume sin, though it also of course waits for the flesh, that by means of that to which it entrusted its thoughts, it may also produce the corresponding deeds. For this will be the principle of the judgment that is designed for the last end, that every divine judgment may be accomplished by putting forward the flesh. Otherwise, I mean if it were designed for souls alone, the judgment would not have to be waited for till the end, because even now souls are being tortured[1] in the lower world.[2]

18. Up to this point, you must understand, I have been dealing[3] merely in preparatory arguments,[4] with the object of supporting the thoughts of all the passages of Scripture[5] that promise the restoration of the flesh. Since this is cared for by

[1] Hoppe, p. 181, interprets the old reading *decerpunt* as "enjoy" (a poetical sense of the word).
[2] For this ending cf. c. 1 and Hoppe, p. 156.
[3] For this perf. subjunctive, cf. 5, 8, 12, and Hoppe, p. 67.
[4] On the metaphor from substructures, cf. Hoppe, p. 214.
[5] *Scriptura*, "passage of scripture," (like γραφή), Hoppe, p. 94 n.

so many influences of just defences, I mean the cc. 5-9
distinctions of its nature itself, God's strength, the cc. 11-13
signs of it, and the inevitable reasons for judgment cc. 14-17
itself, it will of course be necessary that the scriptures should be understood in accordance with the preconceived opinions held by so many authorities, not in accordance with the clever inventions[1] of heretics, which spring from unbelief and unbelief alone, because it is regarded[2] as incredible that matter once withdrawn by death should be restored, not because the matter itself cannot earn this or because it is impossible to God or inconceivable. Clearly it would be incredible if it had not been proclaimed[3] by divine power, if we leave out of account the fact that although it had not been proclaimed[4] by God, it would have had in any case to be taken for granted, and as not having been proclaimed for the reason that it had been presupposed[5] by reason of the number of authorities supporting it. But since it sounds clearly through divine utterances also, there is all the less reason for understanding it otherwise than is desired by those elements by which it is convincingly shown[6] even without divine words. Let us therefore see

[1] On the plural of *ingenium* in this sense, see Hoppe, p. 93, Mayor on *Apol.*, 15, p. 50, l. 8.

[2] *habeatur* = *habetur*, cf. Hoppe, p. 76.

[3] Hoppe (p. 66) expands and explains as = *incredibile* (sc. *erit* = *esset*), *si n p.d. fuerit* (= *fuisset* or *esset*), and thinks *praedicatum fuerit* is future perfect.

[4] For the periphrastic *praedicatum fuisset*, cf. Hoppe, p. 61.

[5] For the alliteration and rime in *praedicatum, praeiudicatum*, cf. Hoppe, p. 167.

[6] On this constr. see Hoppe, p. 15, n. 2.

this first, on what pretext this hope has been dismissed. One, I believe, over all is God's impending edict: "resurrection of the dead." Two words, simple, decisive, terse![1] To these I will address myself, these I will consider: to what nature do they refer? When I hear that resurrection awaits a man, I must needs ask what part of him has happened to fall, since nothing will expect to rise again except what has previously fallen. He who knows not that the flesh falls through death, is capable of not knowing that it stands through life. Nature proclaims aloud the sentence
Gen. iii. 19 of God: "Earth thou art and into earth thou shalt pass," and he who does not hear this, sees it: every death means the fall of the body. That this is the lot of the body was made clear by the Lord also, when He himself, being clothed with a
John iii. 19 material body, said: "Destroy this temple, and I
cf. John ii. 21 will raise it again on the third day." For he showed to what part destruction applies, what part it is that is dashed down and lies there, what part also it is that is lifted up and raised again,—and
cf. Matt. xxvi. 38 yet it carried[2] a quaking soul as far as death, a soul which would not however fall through death—
John ii. 21 because scripture also says: "He had spoken of His body." And so true is it that it is the flesh that is destroyed by death, that it gets the name

[1] On the alliteration in *decisa, detersa*, cf. Hoppe, pp. 117, 150, who says *detersa* is for *tersa* ("easily understood, definite, proper words"), the variation being due to the determination to produce the alliterative effect.

[2] *Quamquam* with subjunctive; cf. Hoppe, p. 78.

cadaver (corpse) from the fact that it falls. But the soul has no suggestion of fall in its name because there is no falling in its nature either. And yet it is the soul that brings a fall upon the body, when it has been breathed out, even as it is the soul also which by entering into it raised it from the ground; that which on entering had power to raise, cannot itself fall; that which on passing out laid low, cannot itself fall. I will speak more emphatically: the soul does not fall along with the body even into sleep, not even then is it laid low with the flesh, but it is really moved and tossed about[1] in sleep; but it would be at rest if it were prostrate. So what does not fall into its image, does not fall into the reality[2] of death either. Consider now similarly to what nature the following word applied to the dead really belongs. Although we admit[3] in this connexion that mortality is sometimes assigned[4] to the soul by heretics in such a way that, if a mortal soul will obtain resurrection, there is a presumption that the flesh also, which is not less mortal, will share in resurrection, yet now the special character of the name must be claimed by its own lot. Already indeed for the very reason that resurrection belongs to something fallen, namely the flesh, it will also be used in connexion

[1] On *iactitare*, synonym of *agitare*, see Hoppe, p. 118.

[2] Abl. for accus.; cf. Hoppe, p. 41. For *ueritate mortis* = *uera morte*, cf. Hoppe, p. 86.

[3] Subjunctive after *quamquam*; cf. an earlier instance in this chapter, and Hoppe, p. 78.

[4] For acc. and infin. with *admittere*, cf. Hoppe, p. 50.

1 Cor. xv. 12, etc.

with what is dead,[1] because "the resurrection" as it is called "of the dead" is the resurrection of a thing that has fallen. We learn this also through

cf. Rom. iv. 11, 16 cf. James ii. 23, etc. cf. Gen. xxiii. 3. Gen. xxiii. 4

Abraham, "the father" of trust, the man who was on terms of friendship with God. For when he begged a place of "the sons of Heth" to bury Sarah,[2] he said: "Grant me then the tenancy of a tomb among you, and I will bury my dead," meaning the flesh. For he would not have desired room to bury the soul, even if the soul were believed to be mortal, and if it deserved to be called "a dead person." But if a dead person is a body, when the expression "resurrection of the dead" is used, it will mean a resurrection of bodies.

19. This examination, therefore, of its title and contents,[3] which of course supports belief in the names, will have to proceed to such a point that, if the opposition creates any confusion by the pretext of figures and riddles, all the most evident facts may predominate and from uncertainty may enjoin certainty. For certain people, having acquired the ordinary manner of prophetic diction, being very often, but not always, addicted to

cf. 1 Cor. xv. 14, etc.

allegory and figures, pervert even "the resurrection of the dead," clearly as it has been proclaimed, to a figurative sense, and aver that even death itself must be understood in a spiritual sense.

[1] A reference again to the derivation of *cadauer* from *cadere*.

[2] For this dative after the substantive, cf. Hoppe, p. 56.

[3] *Praeconium* in the sense "what is contained in the proclamation," "contents"; cf. Hoppe, p. 123.

The death that is visible[1] to all, the severance of flesh and soul, they say, is not real death, but real death is ignorance of God, through which a man dead to God lies no less in the tomb than in error. That that therefore also must be claimed to be resurrection by which a man on coming up to reality, is reanimated and revivified to God, the death of ignorance being dispersed,[2] and breaks forth as it were from the tomb of "the old man," cf. Eph. iv. 22, etc. for, they say, even the Lord compared "the Scribes and Pharisees" to "whitened tombs." Matt. xxiii. 27 From this then it follows that they have by faith attained resurrection with "the Lord," when they "have put Him on" in baptism. By this device, cf. Gal. ii. 27. too, it has been their frequent custom to trick our people even in conversation, pretending that they themselves also admit the resurrection of the flesh. "Woe to him," they say, "who in this flesh has not risen again"; this they say lest the others should at once inflict injury on them, if they at once deny the resurrection. But in the secret of their own consciousness this is what they believe: "Woe to him who while he is in the flesh, does not learn the heretical secrets"[3]: for this is what they mean by "resurrection." But very many also who maintain the resurrection of the soul from death, interpret "coming out of the tomb" as meaning

[1] On the adverbial phrases *in medio* and *in uero*, cf. c. 11 and Hoppe, p. 100.

[2] On *discutere* metaphorically used, as in the poets, cf. Hoppe, p 183.

[3] On this passage, see d'Alès, p. 318.

"escaping from the world," because the world also is a dwelling-place of the dead, that is of those that know not God, or even "from the body" itself, because the body also like a tomb holds the soul fast closed up in the death of worldly life.[1]

20. Because then such are the conjectures they put forth, I will upset their first argument,[2] by which they make out that all the utterances of the prophets were figurative; whereas, if it were so, not even the figures themselves could be distinguished, unless the realities also had been preached,[3] from which the figures were sketched. And, further, if everything was figurative, what will that be which the figures represent? How will you hold out the mirror in front, if there is a face nowhere? Again, everything does not consist of representations, but there are also realities, everything does not consist of shadows, but there are also bodies, so that even in the case of the Lord Himself the more notable characteristics are pro-
cf. Matt. i. 23 claimed as clear as daylight. For the "virgin both conceived in the womb" non-figuratively, and bore "Emmanuel, God with us," in no indirect way; and if it be true that it is only figuratively
Isa. viii. 4 that "He will receive the strength of Damascus

[1] This ending $-\smile-\smile\smile$ is found only in 33 passages (Hoppe, p. 156).

[2] I am strongly tempted to think that Tertullian wrote *primum* (adv.), and that it has been naturally assimilated to the gender of *præstructionem*.

[3] For the periphrastic conjugation, *prædicatae fuissent*, cf. Hoppe, p. 61.

and the spoils of Samaria," it is at least quite evident that "He will come into judgment with the elders and leading men[1] of the people." For "the nations made a disturbance" in Pilate's person, "and the peoples practised vain things" in the person of Israel: "the kings of the earth stood up," namely Herod: "and the rulers assembled together," namely Annas and Caiaphas, "against the Lord and against His Anointed."[2] And "He," too, "was led as a lamb to slaughter," and "as a lamb before the shearer," who is, of course, Herod. Voiceless—"thus He opened not His mouth"—"placing His back conveniently for the lashes and His cheeks for the palms of their hands, and not turning away His face from the arrows[3] of their spittings;" "reckoned also among the unjust," "His hands and feet[4] pierced," suffering the casting of lots over His garment and the bitter draughts and the mocking shakes of heads, being valued at thirty silver pieces by the traitor. What figures are there to be found in Isaiah, what pictures are there in David, what riddles in Jeremiah, who proclaimed not even his mighty works in parables? Or were the "eyes of the blind" not "opened," or did "the tongue of the dumb" not speak clearly? Did not "the withered hands and the unstrung knees recover strength"? Did not

Isa. iii. 14
Ps. ii. 1-2
Isa. liii. 7
cf. Isa. l. 6
cf. Matt. xxvi. 67
Isa. liii. 12
cf. Matt. xxvii. 34, 35, 39; cf. Ps. xxi. 17; Luke xxiv. 30, 40; cf. Ps. xxi. 19; cf. Matt. xxvi. 15; cf. Ps. lxviii. 22, xxi. 8
cf. Matt. xxvii. 9
cf. Jer. xxxix. (xxxii.), 6-9; Zech. xi. 12
cf. Isa. xxxv. 5
cf. Isa. xxxv. 3

[1] For the alliteration in *presbyteris* and *principibus*, cf. Hoppe, p. 152.
[2] On the allegorical interpretation here, see d'Alès, pp. 243 f.
[3] A striking variation on the *αἰσχύνης* (*shame*) of the prophet.
[4] On the so-called Greek accusative, see Hoppe, p. 17.

cf. Isa. xxxv. 6

"the lame leap like a goat"? And even if it is our habit to interpret these spiritually also, by comparison with the physical defects healed by the Lord, since[1] however they were fulfilled also in the flesh, they show that the prophets preached in both ways, without harm to Him, for many of their words can be claimed to be unadorned and simple and clear from[2] any mist[3] of allegory: as when the dooms of nations and cities sound forth, of Tyre and Egypt and Babylon, Edom and the ships of Carthage,[4] as when they relate the plagues or pardons of Israel itself, its captivities, its restorations and the doom of the last scattering. Who will interpret those any more than understand them? Facts are preserved in writing just as writing is read in facts. So not always nor in every case is the allegorical manner of prophetic utterance to be found, but only sometimes and in certain cases.

cf. Isa. ii. 16, xxiii. 1–13, xi. 14

21. If therefore "sometimes, and in certain cases," you say, why not also in the proclamation of a resurrection which is to be spiritually understood? Because, as a matter of fact, many a reason forbids. For, in the first place, what will so many other divine passages do which so clearly attest a bodily resurrection that they do not admit any suspicion of a figurative meaning? And in any case

[1] On causal *cum*, with the indicative, cf. Hoppe, p. 80.

[2] For *purus ab*, cf. Hoppe, p. 36.

[3] On the poetical *nubilum*, cf. c. 16 and Hoppe, p. 179.

[4] He had Καρχηδόνος, "Carthage" in his Bible; the Hebrew gives "Tarshish," "the best identification of which still seems to be Tartessus in Spain" (Prof. G. Buchanan Gray on *Isaiah* ii. 16).

it would be just, as we insisted above, that un- c. 19
certain things should be judged from certain[1] and obscure things from evident, if only to prevent amidst the disagreement of the certain and the uncertain, the clear and the obscure, the destruction[2] of belief, the perilous state of truth, the branding of divinity itself as fickle.[3] In the second place, there is the improbability that such a mystery to which one's whole belief is resigned, towards which all teaching presses,[4] should appear to have been preached in doubtful terms and darkly set forth, since the hope of resurrection, unless quite clear about the risk and the reward, would never prevail upon any one[5] to devote himself, particularly to a religion of that kind, exposed to the hatred of the people and the accusations of enemies. No definite task receives uncertain pay, no justifiable fear springs from a doubtful risk. Both the reward and the risk depend on the result of resurrection. And if temporal and local and individual decrees and judgments of God were so openly launched[6] by prophecy against cities and peoples and kings, how absurd it is to suppose that His everlasting and universal arrangements for the whole human race shunned their own[7] light! The greater they are,

[1] On this maxim, see d'Alès, pp. 242 f.
[2] On the metaphor in *dissipare*, cf. Hoppe, p. 185.
[3] Cf. d'Alès, p. 244.
[4] On the combination of alliteration and rime in *committitur, conititur*, cf. Hoppe, p. 167.
[5] On *pursuadere* with the acc. of the person, cf. Hoppe, p. 15.
[6] On this military metaphor, cf. Hoppe, p. 182.
[7] On the subjective use of the objective genitive *sui*, cf. Hoppe, p. 18.

the more evident they ought to be, that their greatness may be believed. And I fancy that neither jealousy nor cunning nor fickleness nor enticement can be attributed to God, though the authorities make frequent use of these qualities in their quibbling[1] proclamations.[2]

22. We must next have regard to those scriptures also, which in the view of these sensuous,[3] not to call[4] them spiritual people, forbid resurrection either to be conceived of as taking place here and now in the recognition of truth or to be claimed to occur the moment life has ended. Since, however, even the seasons for all our hope are fixed by the holy writings,[5]—at the Advent, I take it, of Christ,—and they may not be fixed earlier, our prayers sigh for[6] the end of the present age,[7] for the passing of the universe too, for "the great day of the Lord," "the day" of wrath and "of repayment," the Last Day, hidden as it is and "known to none but the Father," and yet indicated beforehand by "signs and portents" and clashes of elements and "collisions[8] of nations." I should have gone through

cf. 1 Cor. ii. 14, etc.

cf. Zeph. i. 14, etc. Hos. ix. 7; Isa. lxi. 2 cf. Matt. xxiv. 36 cf. Matt. xxiv. 24 cf. Luke xxi. 25

[1] *Thes.* takes *cauillari* here as depon., but Hoppe (p. 62) here and in c. 35 (after Neue-Wagener) as passive.

[2] On this ending, cf. c. 1 and Hoppe, p. 156.

[3] On Tertullian's use of the word *animalis*, generally of heretics (here of Valentinians, who believed in the resurrection of the *anima*), see d'Alès, p. 454.

[4] On the perf. subjunctive in final clause, cf. Hoppe, p. 67.

[5] For this meaning of *stilus*, see Hoppe, p. 123, who renders "*in* the holy writings."

[6] For the poetical *suspirare* with the accusative, cf. Hoppe, p. 16.

[7] A collection of passages showing this attitude in d'Alès, p. 446.

[8] Hoppe (p. 120) takes it of "afflictions, torments."

the prophecies, if the Lord Himself had said nothing—but we must remember that the prophecies themselves were the Lord's word—but it means more that He sealed them with His own lips. When asked by His pupils when those things were to happen which He had meantime blurted out about the end of the temple, He sets forth the order of history, first Jewish history till the destruction of Jerusalem, then general history till the end of the age. For after He had proclaimed: "And then will Jerusalem be trampled upon by the heathen, until the history of the heathen be completed," who are of course to be selected by God and to be collected along with the remainder of Israel, then for the world and for the age He preaches, according to Joel and Daniel and the whole council of prophets, the "signs" that will come to pass "in the sun and moon and stars, the end[1] of the heathen, with stupefaction at the roar of the sea, and the movement of men turning cold with terror and waiting for those things that threaten the world. For the powers of the heavens," He says, "shall be shaken, and then shall they see the Son of Man coming on the clouds with much power and glory. But when these things have begun to take place, you will come forth and raise your heads, because your redemption has come near." And yet He said it was "approaching," not that it was now present,

cf. Matt. xxiv. 3; Luke xxi. 7
cf. Matt. xxiv. 2; Luke xxi. 6
cf. Matt. xxiv. 5; 31; Luke xxi. 8–28
Luke xxi. 24
cf. Joel ii. 30, 31 (iii 3, 4)
cf. Dan. vii. 13
Luke xxi. 25 28
cf. Luke xxi. 20

[1] What is meant by *conclusionem* here is as uncertain as what is meant by the Greek word it represents, συνοχή. Read *concussionem?*

cf. Luke xxi. 28

and "when these things have begun to take place," not when they have taken place,[1] because when they have taken place, then "your redemption" will be at hand, which is said "to be approaching" up to that point, lifting up meantime and arousing your spirits to the now near realisation of hope, of which also a parable is subjoined about the trees sprouting into the tender shoot, which is the forerunner of the blossom and thereafter of the fruit. "So also you, when you have seen all this taking place, must know that the kingdom of God is at hand." "Be watchful therefore at all times, that you may be deemed worthy to escape[2] all these things and may stand before the Son of Man," of course by means of resurrection, all other things having first been gone through. So although it sprouts at the recognition of the mystery, yet it is in the presentation[3] of the Lord that it begins to blossom and to bear fruit.[4] Who, therefore, has aroused the Lord already so unseasonably, so unripely, from God's right hand, "to smash the earth," according to Isaiah, which earth is, I suppose, still unharmed? Who has already "put Christ's enemies under His feet," according to David, being swifter than the Father, while all the assembly of citizens besides are shouting against them: "the Christians to the lion"?[5] Who has seen Jesus "descending from

cf. Matt. xxiv. 32 Luke xxi. 31

Luke xxi. 36

cf. Isa. ii. 19

Ps. cix. 1

[1] For the periphrastic conjugation, cf. Hoppe, p. 60.
[2] For *dignus* with the infin., cf. Hoppe, p. 49.
[3] On this word, see d'Alès, p. 359.
[4] Note the alliteration and the rime (Hoppe, p. 163).
[5] Cf. *Apol.* 40, p. 116, l. 17 ed. Mayor, with his copious note.

heaven in such guise as" the apostles "had seen Him," according to the command of the angels? [11] Till now no "tribe has mourned for tribe," recognising Him "whom they have pierced," no one as yet has "welcomed Elijah," no one as yet has "fled" from antichrist, no one as yet has "wept for Babylon's end": but there is already One who has risen again, but He is a heretic. Clearly He has gone forth already from the tomb of the body, though He is even now subject to fevers and sores, and He has already "trampled His enemies under foot," though He has [1] even now "to struggle with the powerful ones of the universe," and of course He already reigns, though even now He feels bound "to render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's." [2]

cf. Acts i. 11
cf. Zech. xii. 12 14
cf. Zech. xii. 10
cf. Mal. iv. 4 (iii. 23); cf. Rev. xii. 6
cf. Rev. xviii. 9, 10
cf. Ps. lv. 3
cf. Eph. vi. 12
cf. Matt. xxii. 21

23. The Apostle teaches, it is true, when writing to the Colossians, that we were once dead, "alienated from and hostile to the thoughts" of the Lord, when we were occupied "in evil works," but that afterwards we were "buried with" Christ "in baptism" and "raised together in Him through faith in the working of God who raised Him from the dead:" "And you, when you were dead in sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, He made to live together with Him, forgiving you all your sins," and again: "How do you vote like certain people living in the world?" But although he represents us as thus dead spiritually, while at the

cf. Col. i. 21
cf. Col. ii. 12
Col. ii. 13
Col. ii. 20

[1] On *habere* with infin. = "must," cf. Hoppe, p. 44.
[2] On the ending, cf. c. 1 and Hoppe, p. 156.

same time he recognises that we shall one day die also bodily, assuredly also in like manner, when he regards us having been raised in a spiritual sense, he equally refrains from denying that we shall also
Col. iii. 1, 2 rise in a bodily sense. For he says: "If ye have risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ is seated on the right hand of God; have that wisdom which is above, not that which is below." Thus he shows that it is in mind we rise again, since it is with mind alone that we can as yet touch heavenly things. These we should not seek or understand, if it did not possess
Col. iii. 3 them. He also adds: "For ye are dead"—meaning, to trespasses, not to yourselves—"and your life is hid with Christ in God." Therefore the life that is hidden, is not yet seized. So also John
1 John iii. 2 says: "And it hath not yet been made clear what we shall be. We know that[1] if he makes it clear,[2] we shall be like Him." So far are we from being now what we know not; for certainly we should know if we were that now. Thus at this stage it is merely a contemplation of our hope through faith, not a realisation,[3] not a possession, but merely an expectation. Touching this hope and
Gal. v. 5 expectation Paul says to the Galatians: "For we in spirit through faith wait for the hope of righteousness." He does not say "we grasp"; by "righteousness" he means God's as the result of the

[1] For this *quia*, followed by the indicative, cf. Hoppe, p. 76.
[2] Mr. Baxter suggests *si <se> manifestauerit:* Clairvaux MS. has *si manifestatus erit.*
[3] On *repræsentatio*, see d'Alès, p. 359.

judgment by which a judgment will be given about the reward. It is when expectant with regard to it that he himself, in writing to the Philippians says: "If by any means I may run to the resurrection which is from the dead, not that I have already received or am perfected." And of course he had believed and had learned all the mysteries, "a vessel of election," "the teacher of the nations," and yet he adds: "But I follow on if so be that I may seize that in which I have been seized by Christ." And further: "I do not think, brethren, that I have grasped it: but one thing is clear; forgetting what is behind, and stretching forwards, I press onward towards the mark, to the prize of innocence"[1] through which I must run: of course to resurrection from the dead, but, "at its own proper time," as he says to the Galatians: "But let us not be weary in well-doing, for in due season we shall reap," even as he says also to Timothy about Onesiphorus: "The Lord grant Him to find mercy on[2] that Day." With a view to "that Day" and time he instructs Timothy himself also "to keep the command unstained and irreproachable, against the appearing of the Lord Jesus Christ, whom at the proper time the blessed and only Potentate and King of Kings will reveal,"

Phil. iii. 11-12

Acts ix. 15; 1 Tim. ii. 7

Phil. iii. 12

Phil. iii. 13, 14

Gal. vi. 9

Gal. vi. 9

2 Tim. i. 18

1 Tim. vi. 14, 15

[1] This remarkable text presupposes ἀνεγκλήσεως or ἀνεγκλησίας in the Greek text from which Tertullian's translation comes, instead of the accepted text ἄνω κλήσεως. MSS. known to Origen had also the same reading (see my apparatus to the Revisers' Greek Testament, *ad loc.*). Cf. d'Alès, pp. 241 f.

[2] For the *in* with this abl. (taken perhaps straight from the Greek), cf. Hoppe, p. 31.

meaning God, concerning which time Peter also
Acts iii. 19–21 speaks in Acts: "Repent ye, therefore, and pay heed to the wiping out of your sins, that seasons of refreshing from the face of the Lord may come upon you, and that He may send the Christ erstwhile appointed for you, who must receive the heavens even unto the seasons of establishment of all things that God hath spoken by the mouth of the holy prophets."[1]

Acts iii. 21 24. What those "seasons" are, learn with the
1 Thess. i. 9, 10 Thessalonians. For we read: "How ye turned from images to serve the living and true[2] God, and to await the arrival from the heavens of His son whom He hath raised from the dead, even Jesus."
1 Thess. ii. 19 And again: "For what is our hope or joy or chaplet of exultation, save that ye also may be in presence of our Lord Jesus Christ at his coming?"
1 Thess. iii. 13 Also: "In presence of God and our Father at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all His saints." And when he is teaching about their
cf. 1 Thess. iv. 13 "falling asleep," as no subject for "mourning," he
1 Thess. iv. 14–17 also sets forth the seasons of resurrection: "For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so God will also bring with Him those that slept through Jesus. For this we say to you in the Lord's word, that we who are alive, and who are waiting behind till the arrival of our Lord, shall not precede those that have slept, since the Lord himself with the command and with the voice of an

[1] For this ending, cf. c. 1, and Hoppe, p. 156.
[2] Note the (unavoidable) alliteration here in *uiuo, uero* (Hoppe, p. 153).

archangel and the trumpet of God will descend from heaven; and those that died in Christ will rise again first, then we that are alive, and we shall be raised along with them in the clouds to meet Christ in the air, and thus we shall always be with the Lord." What "archangel's voice," what "trump of God" has been already heard, save perchance in the rooms of heretics? For although "the trump of God" may be a name for the word of the Gospel, which has already called them, yet they will either have died already in a bodily sense to rise again, in which case how do they live? or they will have been snatched away into the clouds, and in that case, how are they here? They are "pitiable" indeed, as the Apostle proclaimed, who will be deemed "to hope in this life only," shutting out, while they first snatch at it, what is promised after the present life, being "deceived with respect to[1] the truth" no less than "Phygelus and Hermogenes" were. And therefore the greatness of the Holy Spirit which understands thoughts of that kind, gives a hint also in that very epistle to the Thessalonians: "With regard to the seasons and the periods of time, brethren, there is no need to write to you. For ye yourselves know most surely that[2] the Day of the Lord will come exactly like a thief in the night. When they shall say 'peace' and 'all is safe,' then sudden ruin will press upon them." And in the second epistle addressed with greater anxiety to

1 Thess. iv. 16
1 Thess. iv. 16
1 Thess. iv. 16
cf. 1 Cor. xv. 19
cf. 1 Tim. i. 19; cf. 2 Tim. i. 15
1 Thess. v. 1–3

[1] For this use of *circa*, cf. Hoppe, p. 37.
[2] For this *quod* followed by indic., cf. Hoppe, p. 75.

2 Thess. ii. 1–7

the same: "I beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord and our assembling with Him, not to be quickly stirred in mind or disturbed, either by a spirit or by a word," he means of false prophets, "or by a letter," he means of false apostles, "as if[1] it were from me, to the effect that the Day of the Lord is imminent. Let no one mislead you in any way; since unless the withdrawal come first," that is of this kingdom, "and the man of sin be revealed," that is the antichrist, "the son of perdition, who offers opposition and raises himself above everything that is called God or religion, actually seeking to sit in God's temple, declaring himself to be God. Do you not remember that when I was with you, I told you this? And you know what is holding him back, that he may be revealed at the proper season. For at this time the secret of iniquity is working:[2] only let him who is now holding him back, continue to do so till he disappear." Who is he but the Roman constitution,

cf. Rev. xvii. 12

2 Thess. ii. 8–10

whose passage to "ten kings" will bring on the scattered powers of antichrist? "And then shall be revealed the unjust one whom the Lord Jesus will slay with the breath of His mouth and will bring to naught by the appearance of His coming, whose coming is according to the working of Satan in all power and signs and portents of falsehood and in every seduction of unrighteousness for them that are perishing."

[1] For *ac si* = *quasi*, cf. Hoppe, p. 84, who notes that Tert. wished to avoid a second *quasi*.

[2] Cf. d'Alès, p. 319.

25. Also in the Apocalypse an order of seasons is set forth,[1] which even "the souls" of the martyrs, clamouring for vengeance and judgment "under the altar," have learned to endure, that first the world on the one hand may have full experience of[2] its "plagues" from "the bowls of the angels," and that prostituted city may meet with a deserved end at the hands of "the ten kings," and "the beast," which is antichrist, with "its false prophet" may bring a conflict upon the Church, and thus when "the devil has" meantime "been banished to the bottomless pit," the privilege of the first resurrection may be ordered from "the thrones," and thereafter, when he has been given over to the fire, the judgment of the universal resurrection may be given from "the books." Since, therefore, the Scriptures both mark the positions of the seasons and place the whole result of the Christian hope at the end of the age, it is clear either that everything promised us by God is then fulfilled—in which case what the heretics maintain in this connexion falls to the ground[3]—or, if resurrection is also a recognition of the truth of doctrine,[4] it is believed of course without prejudice to that which is proclaimed as taking place at the last; and it follows that in the same way as the spiritual character of the latter is

cf. Rev. vi. 9, 10
cf. Rev. xv. 6, 7
cf. Rev. xvii. 12
cf. Rev. xix. 20
cf. Rev. xx. 2, 3
cf. Rev. xx. 4
cf. Rev. xx. 10
cf. Rev. xx. 12

[1] On this sense of *sternere*, see Hoppe, p. 191.
[2] On metaphors from drinking, cf. Hoppe, p. 181.
[3] On this sense of *uacare*, see Hoppe, p. 140.
[4] On this sense of *sacramentum*, "doctrine, objective faith," as in cc. 21, 22, 23, 63, see E. de Backer, *Sacramentum* . . . (Louvain, 1911), pp. 23–41.

maintained, the physical character of the former is believed; because, if none were then preached, naturally this alone, a merely spiritual, resurrection would be maintained, but since it is proclaimed also for the end of time, it is recognised to be physical, because there would not be proclaimed for that time also a resurrection of the same character, I mean a spiritual resurrection, since it would be fitting that it should be completed either now without any postponement of distinction between the seasons, or at that time at the final end of time. Thus it becomes us better to maintain the spiritual character of resurrection also from the beginning of our faith, since we recognise its completeness at the end of the world.[1]

26. One word more[2] I will answer to the view adduced above that certain passages must be interpreted allegorically, namely that we also may maintain a bodily resurrection, by the support of prophetic language which is equally figurative.[3] For look at the Divine sentence at the beginning, declaring man to be earth: "Earth thou art and into earth thou shalt pass," as regards the fleshy nature of course, which had been taken from earth and which the earliest[4] human being had been called, as we have shown: this sentence

Gen. iii. 19

cf. c. 5

[1] On this ending, cf. c. 2 and Hoppe, p. 157.

[2] On *adhuc* = *insuper, praeterea*, cf. Hoppe, p. 110.

[3] Cf. d'Alès, p. 244.

[4] *prior* may refer to Adam with respect to Eve, or it may be a Graecism, *compar.* = *superl.* (cf. Moulton, *A Grammar of N.T. Greek*, vol. I. pp. 78 f.; Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek N.T.*, 3rd ed., pp. 662 f.).

gives me the lesson to interpret as referring also to flesh whatever wrath or favour God has appointed for earth, because neither is earth as such subject to God's judgment, seeing "it has done no good or evil": it was "cursed" simply "because it had drunk blood," and this very curse refers figuratively to the flesh of the murderer. And even if earth too will be benefited or injured on man's account in such a way that he shall be benefited or injured by the fate of his home,[1] how much more will he himself requite what earth also will suffer on his account! Therefore, even when God threatens earth, I shall say that He is threatening flesh rather, and when he is promising anything to earth, I shall understand that He is promising it rather to flesh, as in David: "The Lord has reigned, the earth will rejoice," that is the flesh of the saints, with which flesh is bound up the delight of the divine kingdom; then he adds: "He saw and the earth was shaken; the mountains were melted as wax before the Lord's face," by which is meant of course the flesh of the profane, "and they shall look upon him whom they have pierced."[2] Further, if both these sentences be deemed to have been given explicitly about the element

cf. Rom. ix. 11
cf. Gen. iv. 11
Ps. xcvi. 1
Ps. xcvi. 4, 5
Zech. xii. 10
John xix. 37

[1] *consistori*, classical genitive of *consistorium*, is probably the true reading.

[2] An interesting point of contact with Γ (the Grotta Ferrata palimpsest, saec. viii.–ix.) of LXX. see Swete's *Introduction to the O.T. in Greek*, p. 146; also with Υ (see Oesterley's *Codex Taurinensis* [Frowde, 1908] p. 121). The influence of John xix. 37 cannot, however, be denied.

cf. Ps. xcvi. 4, 5 cf. Ps. xcvi. 1

earth, how will it fit the facts that it should "be shaken and melt before the Lord's face," "in whose reign," as said above, "it rejoiced"? So also in

Isa. i. 19 cf. Isa. i. 19

Isaiah "ye shall eat the good things of the earth" will be understood to mean "the good things" of the flesh, namely those good things that await it in the kingdom of God, when it has recovered form again and has been glorified[1] and will attain what

1 Cor. ii. 9 (cf. Isa. lxiv. 4)

"neither eye hath seen nor ear hath heard nor the mind of man hath been able to comprehend." Otherwise it is quite useless that[2] God should encourage man to obedience by the fruits of the land and the food of the present life, which by the creation once for all accorded to man He shares even with the irreligious and the evil-speaking,

Matt. v. 45

"sending His rain on the good and the evil and His sun on the just and the unjust." Happy to be sure is faith if it is to attain what the enemies of God and Christ not only use but even misuse,

cf. Rom. i. 25

"worshipping the creation[3] itself as against the Creator." Will you consider onions and truffles

Isa. i. 19 Matt. iv. 4 (Deut. viii. 3), etc.

among "the good things of earth," though the Lord declares that "man will live not even on bread"? Even so the Jews in hoping only for earthly things, lose heavenly things, knowing naught either of

cf. John vi. 51

"bread" promised "from heaven"[4] or the oil of

[1] "Angelified" properly, made like the angels of God (ἰσάγγελος of Luke xx. 36); *angelifico* appears to be an *hapax eiremenon.*

[2] For the construction *uanum est ut*, cf. Hoppe, pp. 81 f.

[3] For *conditio*, abstr. form in concr. sense, cf. cc. 11, 13, and Hoppe, p. 92.

[4] For *de caelesti* = *e caelo*, cf. Hoppe, pp. 38, 99.

divine anointing or the water of the Spirit and the wine of the soul that derives its strength from "the vine" that is Christ. Even so [1] they consider that "the holy land" itself, which is properly speaking the soil of Judea, should rather be considered the Lord's flesh, which thus is "holy land" also in all that have "put on Christ," [2] truly "holy" through the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, truly "dripping with milk and honey" through the sweetness of hope itself, truly Judea through its friendship with God—"for it is not he who is in public that is the real Jew, but he who is in secret"—so that it should also be temple of God and Jerusalem, hearing from Isaiah the words: "Arise, arise, Jerusalem, put on the strength of thine arm, arise even as in the day at the beginning," which means of course in the freshness which it had had before the sin of disobedience. For how will the words of that kind of exhortation and consolation [3] suit the "Jerusalem, which killed the prophets and stoned them that were sent unto her" and at last despatched her very Lord? But as a matter of fact salvation is not promised to any land at all, for each must "pass away" along with "the fashion of the whole universe." Even if any one will dare to argue rather that "the holy land" is paradise, which land it would be possible should be called also that "of the fathers," namely Adam

cf. John xv. 1
cf. Exod. iii. 5
cf. Exod. iii. 5
cf. Gal. iii. 27, etc.
cf. Exod. iii. 17
Rom. ii. 28, 29
Isa. li. 9
cf. Matt. xxiii. 37, etc.
cf. 1 Cor. vii. 31
cf. Exod. iii. 5
Gen. xlviii. 21

[1] Here one must either put a comma at *Christi* or read *Sic et.*

[2] For this so-called Greek accusative with *indutus*, cf. Hoppe, p. 17.

[3] For *aduocatio* = *consolatio, solacium*, cf. Hoppe, p. 118.

and Eve, in like manner restitution to paradise also will seem to have been promised to the flesh, which has received the right to inhabit[1] and guard it, so that a man of the same character as was driven thence may be recalled to it.[2]

27. We must[3] also consider the mention of garments in the Scriptures as an allegory with reference to the hope of the flesh,[4] because the Revelation of John also says: "those are they that have not sullied their garments with women," meaning of course "virgins," and "those who have mutilated themselves for the kingdom of heaven's sake." Therefore they shall "be in white robes," that is in the glory of unmarried flesh, and in the Gospel "the wedding garment" can be recognised as holiness of the flesh. Therefore Isaiah when explaining what kind of "fasting the Lord hath chosen," when he adds about the reward of goodness: "Then thy light shall break forth in good time and thy garments shall speedily arise," wishing it to be understood, of course, not as a half silk garment nor as an upper garment, but as the flesh, he preached of the dawn of the flesh that was to rise again from the setting of death. To us also, you see, allegory is available as a defence of a physical resurrection. For when we read too: "My people, enter ever so little into your butler's

cf. Rev. iii. 4, xiv. 4
Matt. xix. 12
cf. Rev. iii. 5
cf. Matt. xxii. 11
cf. Isa. lviii. 6
Isa. lviii. 8
Isa. xxvi. 20

[1] For *incolare* = *incolere*, cf. Hoppe, p. 136, n. 3.
[2] For this ending, cf. c. 2 and Hoppe, p. 157.
[3] For *habere* = "must," cf. below in this ch., also c. 22 and Hoppe, p. 44.
[4] Cf. d'Alès, p. 244.

pantries, until my wrath pass away," the "butler's pantries" may be[1] tombs in which those will have[2] to rest for a little while who at "the ends of the age" have passed away under the last wrath through the force of antichrist. Or why did he rather use the name "butler's pantries," and not some place of reception or other, except that in "butler's pantries" flesh is kept salted and put apart for use, to be brought forth from there at the proper time? For in like manner also bodies treated with spices for burial[3] are laid apart in tombs and monuments,[4] to come forth thence when the Lord commands.[5] Since this is the proper way to understand the fact,—for what "butler's pantries" will afford us shelter from the wrath of God?—by the very fact that he says: "Until the wrath pass," namely the wrath which will extinguish antichrist, he shows that after the wrath is spent the flesh will "come forth" from the tomb, into which, before the wrath break out, it has[6] been brought. For even from "butler's pantries" nothing is brought out but what is brought in, and after the uprooting of antichrist resurrection will be in full swing.[7]

cf. 1 Cor. x. 11

Isa. xxvi. 20

cf. John xi. 43

[1] For the fut. where we should expect a potential, cf. Hoppe, p. 65.

[2] See the note at the beginning of the chapter.

[3] This is, I think, the right construction, not that which Lewis-Short and the *Thes.* (s.v. *condimentum*) appear to favour, namely the taking of *sepulturæ* as dat. after *sequestrantur*.

[4] The distinction is apparently that of more and less elaborate tombs. For the alliteration, cf. Hoppe, p. 151.

[5] On this simile, see Hoppe, p. 215, with n. 4.

[6] On this periphrastic conjugation, *fuerit inlata*, cf. Hoppe, p. 60.

[7] On this ending, cf. c. 2 and Hoppe, p. 157.

28. Moreover we know that prophecy has been made not only in words but also in facts; the resurrection is preached as much by words[1] as by deeds. When Moses "puts his hand in his bosom and brings it forth" dead, and again "puts it in and stretches it out" full of life, does he not proclaim this with regard to the whole man?[2] Surely so, inasmuch as the threefold power of God was indicated by those three signs in the proper order, first that which will make subject to man the devil-serpent, terrible as he is, second that which will pull back flesh "from the bosom" of death, and lastly that which will follow up all bloodshed with judgment. Concerning this there is a word in the same prophet: "Since," says God, "I shall seek your blood also from all beasts, from the hand of man and from the hand of a brother shall I seek it." Again, nothing is sought except what is claimed,[3] nothing is claimed except what will also be given up, and that of course will be given up which will be claimed and sought by way[4] of vengeance. That which has not existed, will not be claimed. But it will exist, since it is being restored, so that it may be claimed. Therefore whatever is preached with reference to blood has a reference to flesh, without which there will be no blood. Flesh will be raised that blood may be claimed. There are also certain things proclaimed in such a way that

cf. Exod. iv. 6, 7

cf. Exod. iv. 2-9

Gen. ix. 5

[1] See d'Alès, p. 244.
[2] Or, "Does not this prophesy with regard to the whole man?"
[3] As a right.
[4] On this *nomine* = *causa*, cf. c. 16 and Hoppe, p. 30.

while they are without the cloud[1] of allegory, they nevertheless demand[2] the interpretation of their clearness, for example these words in Isaiah[3]: "I will put to death and bring to life." It is clearly after He has put to death that He will make alive. Therefore it is through death that He puts to death, and it is through resurrection that He will make alive. And if to put to death is to snatch the soul from the flesh, while to make alive, its opposite, means to restore the soul to the flesh, it is absolutely necessary that the flesh should rise again, for to it the soul that was snatched away by killing must be restored by quickening. Deut. xxxii. 39

29. Therefore if both the allegorical passages of Scripture and the logic of facts and plain words give a glimmering of the resurrection of the flesh,[4] without naming that material itself, how much less may one call in question those that by special mention assign that hope to bodily substances themselves! Listen to Ezekiel, who says: "And the hand of the Lord came over me and the Lord raised me in spirit and set me in the midst of a plain: it was crammed full of bones, and He took me round about over them, and behold many of them were on the surface of the plain, and behold they were very[5] dry. And He said to me: 'Son Ezek. xxxvii. 1-14

[1] On this use of *nubilum*, cf. cc. 16, 20 and Hoppe, p. 179.
[2] For this sense of *sitire*, cf. Hoppe, p. 182.
[3] An error of memory on Tertullian's part.
[4] Cf. d'Alès, p. 244.
[5] On this frequent sense of *satis* (here a translation of σφόδρα), see Löfstedt, *Philol. Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae*, pp. 73 f.

of man, shall[1] these bones live?' and I said: 'Lord God, thou knowest.' And He said to me: 'Prophesy over those bones and say: Dry bones, hear a word from the Lord: Thus saith the Lord God to these bones: Behold I bring upon you breath, and ye shall live, and I will put upon you sinews[2] and I will draw flesh over you again and I will put skin all round you and will put breath in you, and ye shall live and shall learn that I am the Lord and that I prophesied according to command, and behold a voice while I am prophesying, and behold a movement: and bones came up to bones, and I looked, and behold there were sinews above the bones and flesh came up and pieces of flesh were put around them, and[3] there was no breath in them. And He said to me: Prophesy to the breath, son of man, prophesy and say to the breath: Thus saith the Lord God: Come, O breath, from the four quarters of heaven, and breathe on these slain ones, and let them live. And I prophesied to the breath, even as He commanded me, and the breath entered into them and they lived and stood upon their feet, a very great host.[4] And He said to me: Son of man, these bones are the whole household of Israel.

[1] On this direct interrog. *si*, cf. Hoppe, p. 73, n. 1. It is prob. a Grecism, the Greek $\epsilon\tilde{\iota} = \tilde{\eta}$ being misunderstood as $\epsilon\grave{\iota} =$ "if."

[2] Kroymann is almost certainly right in substituting here *neruos* for the *spiritum* of the MSS., which comes from the preceding line. The error may go back to the author's autograph.

[3] The Greek καί compels one to read *et* instead of *set* (*sed*).

[4] Probably *ualentia* is here the first decl. substantive, as Rönsch takes it (*It. u. Vulg.*, p. 51), not the participle.

They themselves say: Our bones have become exceeding dry and our hope is lost, we have been wrenched away in them.[1] Wherefore prophesy to them: Lo I open your burial places and I will convey you from your burial places, my people, and I will bring you into the land of Israel, and ye shall learn that I the Lord have opened your burial places and have led you out from your burial places, my people, and that I shall give you breath and ye shall live and rest in your land and learn that I the Lord have spoken and will act,[2] saith the Lord."

30. I know how this pronouncement too is battered[3] by them into an argument for allegory. They contend that in saying "These bones are the whole household of Israel," he made them out to be a picture of Israel and transferred them from their proper circumstances;[4] and that thus the preaching of resurrection is figurative, not real.[5] For the Jewish State is indicated as in some way dead, dried up, and scattered about on the plain of the world. And this is the reason that the image of resurrection is given allegorically in reference to Ezek. xxxvii. 11

[1] What *in eis* means is uncertain, but the real interest lies in the *auulsi sumus* which appears to be a pre-Hexaplaric LXX reading. The LXX as we know it has διαπεφωνήκαμεν, "we have breathed our last." The Hebr. and the Vg. have respectively "we are clean cut off" and "abscissi sumus."

[2] This is the correct translation: compare the Greek ποιήσω, and also the exegesis below, c. 30 *ex.*

[3] On the poetical use of *quatere* and compounds, cf. Hoppe, p. 183.

[4] By this he means that he used the expression "bones" metaphorically.

[5] Cf. for cc. 30–32, d'Alès, pp. 244, 249.

it, that it[1] will[2] be gathered together again and refitted together, "bone" to "bone," that is, tribe to tribe and community to community, and re-embodied by "the flesh" of wealth and "the sinews" of rule, and thus to "be led forth from the burial places," that is, the grim and foul[3] habitations of captivity, and be made to breathe again[4] by means[5] of refreshment, and thenceforth to live "in their own country" Judea. And what after that? They will certainly die. And what after death? No resurrection,[6] I fancy,[7] if the very one that is revealed to Ezekiel will not take place. But in truth resurrection is proclaimed elsewhere also. Therefore that will be the resurrection, and it is unreasonable of them to change it to the Jewish State. Or if that which we support is other than theirs, it makes no difference to me, provided it be a resurrection of bodies as well as of the Jewish State. For by the very fact that the renewal of the Jewish State is pictured in the re-embodiment[8] and reanimation[9] of bones, it is proved that also will happen to bones. For a figure could not be produced from bones, if the same experience were not to be that of the bones also. Even if it is in

[1] *i. e.* The Jewish Constitution, or State.
[2] On *habere*, indicating futurity, cf. Hoppe, pp. 44 f.
[3] On the alliteration, *tristissimis, tæterrimis*, cf. Hoppe, p. 153.
[4] On this transitive *respirare*, developed out of the intrans. use, cf. Hoppe, p. 137, with n. 4.
[5] On *nomine* = *causā*, cf. cc. 16, 28 and Hoppe, p. 30.
[6] On this word, cf. Hoppe, p. 138, n.
[7] This ironical *opinor* is characteristic of Tertullian.
[8] *Recorporatio* = μετενσωμάτωσις (Hoppe, p. 138, n.).
[9] *Redanimatio* = μετεμψύχωσις (Hoppe, p. 138, n.).

a picture that we find a representation of reality, the picture itself has a reality of its own. It must itself first have something which makes it possible to compare[1] it with another. A similitude from void has no fitness, a parable[2] with no background is inept.[3] Thus we shall have to believe that bones also may be re-covered with flesh[4] and may be refurnished with breath, as they put it,[5] from which a representation of a Jewish revolution such as they picture might be made. But it is more in accordance with religion that truth should be defended by its own straightforwardness[6] which the thought in the divine purpose demands. For if this vision had reference to the Jewish State, he would have immediately added after revealing the situation of the bones: "These bones are the whole house of Israel," and the rest thereafter. But when after the bones have been shown, he interjects a remark about their special hope, not yet naming Israel, and tests the prophet's faith: "Son of man, shall those bones live?" with the

Ezek. xxxvii. 11

Ezek. xxxvii. 3

[1] This reference for *configuro* is omitted by *Thes.*

[2] This sentence derives an interest from the fact that *similitudo* was the first translation for παραβολή (see Sanday in *Old Latin Biblical Texts*, II. p. cxxiii).

[3] Note the brachylogy here: *d. uac. sim.* = *sim. quae. d. uac. est;* so with *de nullo parabola;* cf. Hoppe, p. 142. On the alliteration and rime in *conpetit, conuenit,* cf. Hoppe, p. 169.

[4] It must be remembered that "*uiscus, uiscera* occur very often in Lucretius, and always I believe denote the whole of the flesh and soft substance between the skin and bones" (Munro on Lucr., I. 837). On *reuisceratio,* see Hoppe, p. 138, n.

[5] This clause is an apology for the use of *respiratio* in a new sense; the use has escaped the notice of the lexicographers.

[6] I venture to add one to the already existing emendations, and conjecture *de sua simplicitate* simply.

Ezek xxxvii. 3

result that he answered: "Lord, thou knowest," God would certainly not have tested the prophet's faith about that which was not to take place, that which Israel had never heard, that which should not be believed, but since it was really a proclamation of the resurrection of the dead, while Israel true to his unbelief disbelieved and stumbled at it, and beholding the manner of a belated burial nourished no hope of resurrection, or rather did not set his mind to it but instead to his own troubles, for these reasons God both fitted the prophet beforehand, being as he was himself also in doubt, for resolute preaching, revealing to him the manner of resurrection, and commanded the people to believe what He revealed to the prophet, saying that the very people who did not believe that the bones would rise again,[1] were the bones that were to rise again. Further, at the end He says: "And ye shall learn that I the Lord have spoken and will act," meaning of course that He would do what He had said; but He would not have been going to do what He had said, if He had been going to act otherwise than He had said.

Ezek. xxxvii. 14

31. Clearly, if the people were in an allegory grumbling that their bones had become dry and their hope lost, bewailing their final dispersion, it would be natural to suppose that God had consoled their figurative despair by a figurative promise. But since the harm of dispersion had

[1] It is tempting to alter the second *resurrectura* to <*se*> *resurrecturos*.

not yet as a matter of fact come upon the people, while the hope of resurrection had often sounded [1] in their ears, they are clearly using [2] the death of the bodies to undermine confidence in a resurrection. Thus God was building up again the belief that the people were undermining.[3] And yet if Israel were at that time entangled in some struggle with existing circumstances, the purpose [4] of the revelation would not have had to be taken as a similitude,[5] but as giving evidence for resurrection, that it might raise them to that hope, I mean the hope of everlasting salvation and more inevitable restoration, and might turn them away from regard to the present. For it was with this aim that another prophet [6] also said: "Ye shall depart" Mal. iv. 2
(from the burial places) "like calves loosened from their tethers, and ye shall trample your enemies," and again: "Your heart will rejoice and your Isa. lxvi. bones will arise like grass," [7] because grass also [14] gets form again from the breaking up and wasting of the seed. To sum up; if the image of the bones rising again is specially strained to refer to Israel's constitution, why is not the same hope of

[1] *Cecinisset* implies prophecies in *verse* (cf. *Apol.*, c. 46, p. 128, l. 18, ed. Mayor).

[2] *manifestus est . . . labefactans:* Hoppe (p. 58) compares the construction with *φανερός εἰμι*.

[3] For the rime *restruebat, destruebat*, cf. Hoppe, p. 165.

[4] On *intentio*, see an excellent note of Mayor on Plin., epist. III. 5, § 17.

[5] Surely *parabolam* should be read as parallel to *testationem*.

[6] I think *prophetes* of the MSS. must be right, and that *alii* is a mistake for *alius*.

[7] If *uelociter* is a corruption of *uelut herba*, as it seems to be, the character of the MS. tradition is disquieting.

re-embodying and re-animating[1] remains and of raising dead from their graves also preached, not only to Israel but also to all races? For it was with reference to all that these words were used: "The dead shall live, they shall rise up from their tombs: for the dew that cometh from Thee is healing to their bones."[2] Also elsewhere: "All flesh will come to worship in my sight, saith the Lord." When? When "the fashion of this world has" begun to "pass away." For above are these words: "As the new heaven and the new earth, my handiwork, are in my sight, saith the Lord, so shall your seed stand." Then, therefore, that also which he adds shall be fulfilled: "and they will go out," of course from the tombs, "and will see the limbs of those that have done impiously, since their worm will not pass away and their fire will not be quenched, and all flesh will see this and be satisfied," namely that flesh which, having been raised again and left graves, will worship the Lord for this favour.

Isa. xxvi. 19

Isa. lxvi. 23

cf. 1 Cor. vii. 31

Isa. lxvi. 22

Isa. lxvi. 24

32. But lest the proclamation should seem to be made with regard to the resurrection only of such bodies as are entrusted to tombs, you find it written: "And I will give command to the fish of the sea and they will give forth the bones that have been eaten, and I will make joint fit with joint and bone with

cf. Book of Enoch, 61, 5

[1] On the new coinages *recorporare* and *redanimare*, influenced by the desire for parallelism, cf. Hoppe, p. 116. For the alliteration and the rime, cf. Hoppe, p. 163.

[2] Tertullian seems here to have altered the text to suit his own purpose; LXX. has simply *αὐτοῖς* (*to them*).

bone."[1] "Therefore," you say, "fish also will be raised again and all other beasts and flesh-eating birds, that they may give forth what they have eaten, because you read also in Moses that blood is to be sought from all beasts?" Not at all. But beasts and fish are named for this reason with regard to the restoration of flesh and blood, that the resurrection even of devoured bodies may be better expressed, seeing that proclamation is made of an exaction from the very devourers. I imagine, too, that Jonah furnishes a reliable proof of this divine power also, since he is cast out from the belly of the fish, unimpaired in both natures, flesh and spirit,—and assuredly the monster's organs would have been just as able to digest the flesh[2] in three days as the bier, as the tomb, as some long past burial with embalming in a place of rest,[3]—without prejudice to the view that the beast[4] also figuratively represented men using cruelty above all to the name of Christian, or even the very messengers of unrighteousness, of whom blood will be demanded by a vengeance which must be inflicted. Who therefore that is more eager to learn than to assume, more careful to believe than to dispute, and rather conscientious about[5] divine wisdom

cf. Gen. ix. 5

cf. Jon. ii. 11

cf. Jon. ii. 1

[1] The identification of the source of this quotation is apparently due to d'Alès, p. 225, who points out that several (actually six) times Tertullian cites this book as Holy Scripture.

[2] For the dative of the geundive here, see Hoppe, p. 55.

[3] For *requietus* = *quietus*, cf. Hoppe, p. 117.

[4] *Bestia*, Kroymann's certain emendation for *bestias* of the MSS.

[5] For *religiosus* with the genitive, cf. Hoppe, p. 24.

than passionately fond [1] of his own, if he hears that something has been designed by God for flesh and skin and sinews and bones, will speak of these things in any other way, contending that what is proclaimed with regard to these parts is not intended for man? For either nothing is intended for man, not the lavish gift of a kingdom, not sternness of judgment, not resurrection, whatever it is, or if something is intended for man, it must be intended for these parts of which man is built up. Further I put this question to these cunning[2] transformers of bones and flesh and sinews and graves, why, if ever anything is proclaimed with reference to the soul, they do not interpret the soul as meaning anything else nor do they transform it to prove something else, but when anything is proclaimed with reference to some bodily form, they assert that it means anything rather than what it is called? If references to the body are mere similitudes, so also are references to the soul, and if references to the soul are not, neither can references to the body be so. For man is as much body as soul; and it follows that one form cannot be susceptible of cryptic interpretation, while another excludes it.[3]

33. Enough as regards prophetic documents. I appeal now to the Gospels,[4] though here also I shall

[1] For *libidinosus* with the genitive, cf. Hoppe, p. 23. For the rime between *religiosus* and *libidinosus*, cf. Hoppe, p. 165.

[2] Cf. *astutiae*, c. 33 pr.; but perhaps "noisy."

[3] For this ending, cf. c. 2, and Hoppe, p. 157.

[4] For Tertullian they are of equal canonical value; cf. d'Alès, p. 222.

have first to attack their same cunning, as they contend that the Lord also in like manner proclaimed "everything in parables," because it is written: "All these things spake Jesus in parables, and without a parable spake He not unto them," that is, of course, to the Jews. For even His "disciples said: 'Why speakest Thou in parables?'" and the Lord "replied: 'For this reason speak I in parables to them that though they see they may not perceive, and though they hear they may not understand,'" in the words of "Isaiah." But though He "spoke to" the Jews "in parables," that does not mean that He spoke to all thus: even if He spoke to all in parables, He did not always use parables nor was everything He said parabolic,[1] but only certain things, when He spoke to certain people, and the certain people were Jews; sometimes clearly He used parable to disciples also. But consider the manner of the scripture reference: "Moreover He also told them a parable." Therefore He spoke also what was not parable, because the occasions when He employed parable would not have been remarked, if He had always spoken in that way. And, besides, you cannot find any parable that was not either explained by Himself, for example that of the sower with reference to the dispensation of the word, or first illuminated by the writer of the gospel, as that of the disdainful judge and the widow that urged her persistent prayer, or to be guessed

cf. Matt. xiii. 34 Matt. xiii. 34

Matt. xiii. 10 Matt. xiii. 11, 13

cf. Matt. xiii. 14 (Isa. vi. 9)

Luke xviii. 9

cf. Matt. xiii. 18 23

cf. Luke xviii. 1 8

[1] Cf. d'Alès, p. 244.

without help, as that of the fig tree, the cutting
cf. Luke xiii. 6–9 down of which was postponed in hope, like[1] the Jewish unfruitfulness. But if even parables do not overshadow the light of the Gospel, all the less reason why thoughts and statements[2] whose character is quite clear should be understood differently from the way in which they are expressed. Now the Lord proclaims in statements[2] and thoughts "the judgment," "the kingdom of God," and "the
Matt. xi. 24 resurrection." "It will be more endurable," He says, "for Tyre and Sidon in the day of judg-
Matt. x. 7 ment," and: "Tell them that the Kingdom of God
Luke xiv. 14 has come near," and: "You will be recompensed at the resurrection of the righteous." If these are clearly names of things, that is of "judgment" and "the kingdom of God" and "resurrection," so that none of them can be forced into a parable, then neither can the words which are proclaimed with regard to the arrangement and ending and suffering of the Jewish[3] kingdom and its resurrection, be forced into parables; and thus they will be claimed to be bodily as being designed for the bodily, and not spiritual, because not figurative. For that reason also we have laid down that the body of soul, as much as the body of flesh, is subject to rewards which are to be meted out in proportion to their common working, lest the bodily character of the soul, by furnishing an opportunity for figurative

[1] On *ad instar* see Wölfflin in *Archiv f. lat. Lex.*, II. (1885), pp. 590 ff. See also IV. (1887), p. 357.
[2] The word might be rendered "rules."
[3] The true reading from the Clairvaux MS.

language, should shut out the bodily character of the flesh, whereas both must be believed to have a share in "the kingdom" and "the judgment" and "the resurrection." And now we go on to prove that the bodily character of flesh, strictly so called, is meant by the Lord wherever He mentions resurrection, without prejudice to the spiritual, which itself has been accepted by few.[1]

34. In the first place, when He says that He "has come for the purpose of saving that which was lost," what do you say "was lost"? Man, of course. In whole, or in part? Certainly, in whole, since the transgression which is the cause of man's ruin was committed as much by the soul's impulse arising from desire as by the action of the flesh from tasting, and stamped the whole man with the charge of transgression and therefore with the deserved loss. Therefore he will be saved in his entirety who perished in his entirety through sin, unless perhaps the lost sheep in the Gospel is without a body and is recalled without a body. For if its flesh also along with the soul, which together constitute the whole animal, is carried home on the shoulders of the good shepherd, it is a type of the man that must be restored, of course in both his parts. Else, how unworthy of God it is, to bring half the man to salvation; it is almost to do less than man would do, since it is always the full indulgence even of earthly emperors that is claimed. Shall the devil be regarded as stronger to injure

cf. Luke xix. 10

cf. Luke xv. 4–6

[1] For this ending, cf. Hoppe, p. 156.

man, since he dashes the whole man to pieces? And shall God be reported as the weaker, since He cannot raise up the whole man? But, it may be said, even the Apostle hints that "where sin has abounded, there grace has been superabundant." How indeed can he be considered "safe" who may be also called "lost"? "Lost" as regards the flesh, of course, but "safe" as regards the soul, unless the soul also must now be put in the position of "what is lost,"[1] that it may be saved; for that which has been "lost," will have to be "saved." Further, we accept the immortality of the soul, in such a way that it is believed to be "lost" not for destruction, but for punishment, that is for gehenna. And if that is so, salvation will not then have reference to the soul, which is of course safe in its own nature through immortality, but rather to the flesh, which, it is well known to all, is perishable. Or if the soul also is perishable (that is, not immortal), as the flesh is, then that rule will have to benefit the flesh equally, which is equally mortal and perishable, since it is that which is lost that the Lord is to save. I am unwilling at this stage to engage in a tug of war[2] to discuss whether destruction claims man in this direction or in that, provided a salvation made exactly equal for both parts of him determine his destiny in both respects. For, look you, in whatsoever part of his nature you assume a man

cf. Rom. v. 20

[1] Hoppe (p. 100) explains *in perdito* as a prepositional phrase = *perdita*. [2] On this metaphor, cf. Hoppe, pp. 210 f.

is lost, in the other he is not lost. He will therefore be safe then in the part in which he does not perish, and he will none the less become safe in that part in which he does perish. You thus get the restoration of the whole man, since, on the one hand, whatever part of him is lost the Lord will save, and, on the other hand, whatever part is not lost, he will certainly not lose. Who will further doubt about the safety of both parts, since one of them will attain salvation, and the other will not lose it? And yet the Lord expresses the matter in thought also, when He says: "I have come to John vi. 38
do not my own will, but the will of the Father who sent me." What? I pray you. "That I John vi. 39
may lose nothing of all that He hath given me, but may raise it up again at the last day." What had Christ received from the Father except what He had also put on? Man, of course, the structure of flesh and soul. He will therefore permit neither of those He has received to perish, nay rather not any part of either, nay rather not even a small part. But if flesh is a small part, therefore not even flesh, because it is not really a small part. Nor anything at all. But indeed if He will not "raise" flesh also cf. John vi. 39
"again at the last day," then it will not be a case of allowing a little to be lost from man, but in view of the importance of this part I should style it almost the whole. Driving the point farther home,[1] He says: "This is the Father's will, that John vi. 40

[1] Hoppe may be right in defining *ingerere* here as "to add" (p. 133).

every one that beholds the Son and believes in Him, shall have everlasting life, and I shall raise him at the last day," and thus builds up the fulness of the resurrection. For He divides to each part through its specific functions the reward of salvation, namely, to the flesh through which the Son was seen, and to the soul through which He was believed. "Therefore," you will say, "the thing will have been promised to those by whom Christ was seen." So be it certainly, if you allow that the same hope has thence trickled to us also. For if to those "who saw and therefore believed" the works of the flesh and the spirit were then profitable, much more to us. For "happier are they that see not and yet will believe": [1] since, even if the resurrection of the flesh were denied to them, it would certainly have been suited to "the happier." Moreover, how can they be "happy," if they are in part doomed to perish? [2]

cf. John xx. 29

cf. John vi. 29

35. But He also teaches that "He is rather to be feared who can slay both body and soul and cast them into gehenna," that is the Lord alone, not those that kill the body but cannot do any injury to the soul, namely human powers. So here also the soul is recognised to be an immortal substance that cannot be killed by men. It is clear too that mortality belongs to the flesh, which also slaughter

cf. Matt. x. 28

[1] Tertullian's argument favours the MSS. in reading the future here; it is also supported by the Old-Latin MS. e of the Gospels, though it has *uiderunt*.

[2] This ending (– ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑) which is that commended by Quintilian, occurs only fourteen times in Tertullian (Hoppe, p. 158).

concerns, and that thus the resurrection of the dead also belongs to the flesh which, unless it has been raised again, it will not be possible "to put to death and cast into gehenna." But since here also questioners quibble[1] about the interpretation of "body," I should understand[2] by man's "body" nothing else but this heap of flesh, with whatsoever kind of materials it is put together in varied proportion, what is seen, what is grasped, what finally may be killed by men. So also I should admit the "body" of a wall to be nothing but mortar, but stones, but bricks. If any one wishes to introduce some mysterious body, let him show, reveal, prove that it is also the body that man can kill, and I shall admit the words were used of it. Also, if body is opposed to soul, there will be no place for cunning. For when the statement is made that both, namely body and soul, are "slain and cast into gehenna," body is distinguished from soul, and the only conclusion is that by "body" is understood that which is at hand, flesh of course,[3] which although it will "be slain and cast into gehenna," if it is not more afraid of death at God's hands, will yet be made alive to eternal life, if it prefers rather to be slain by men. In like manner if any one will lay hold of the slaughter of flesh and spirit and their consignment to gehenna and maintain that this means the

cf. Matt x. 28

cf. Matt. x. 28

cf. Matt. x. 28

[1] Hoppe (p. 62) here, as in c. 21, takes *cauillor* as passive; Kroymann brackets *quaestio*.

[2] *Intellegam* of the MSS. is right, cf. *admittam* below.

[3] See d'Alès, p. 62.

destruction and death of both natures, not their penalty, means that they are to be consumed, not punished, let him recall that the fire of gehenna
cf. Matt. xxv. 46 is proclaimed to be eternal, with a view to everlasting punishment, and let him thus recognise the everlasting character of the slaughter, which is for that reason more to be dreaded[1] than the sort inflicted by man, which is only temporal. Then he will believe that those natures are eternal whose penal slaughter is eternal. Certainly when after
cf. Matt. x. 28 resurrection "the body with the soul has to be put to death and cast into gehenna," there will be enough certainty about both, both about a resurrection of flesh and an everlasting slaughter. Otherwise it would be most ridiculous, if flesh that
cf. *ibid.* has been raised will be "slain and cast into gehenna" for the purpose of being brought to an end, since even without being raised again it would have this experience. It will of course be restored for this purpose, lest there should be something which had already experienced non-existence. When upholding us for the same hope, He adds the example
cf. Matt. x. 29 also of "the sparrows, that of two not one falls to the ground without God's will," that you may believe that in like manner the flesh also which has fallen on the ground can rise again through the will of the same God. For even though sparrows
cf. Matt. x. 31 may not do this, yet[2] we "are better than[3] many

[1] For this sense of *praetimere*, cf. Hoppe, pp. 30, 136.
[2] On *sed* in the apodosis after *etsi*, as in c. 14, cf. Hoppe, p. 108.
[3] On *antistare* with the dative, cf. Hoppe, p. 27.

sparrows" in this respect that when we fall we rise again, and when He declares that even "all the hairs of" our "head are numbered," He promises that they will of course be saved. For if they were to be lost, what reason would there have been for subjecting them to counting? Unless that this verse "That I may not lose anything of all that the Father hath given me," means not even a hair, just as it means not even an eye and not even a tooth. Besides, whence "will the weeping and gnashing of teeth" come, except from the eyes and from the teeth, the body also having been of course "killed and cast into gehenna," thrust down "into outer darkness," which is a torture particularly for the eyes, if any one at the wedding is clothed in unworthy garments,[1] straightway to be "bound hands and feet," inasmuch as he has risen <again> with a body. That thus therefore it itself should recline in God's kingdom and sit on the twelve[2] thrones and should then take up a position on the right hand or on the left hand and "eat of the tree of life,"[3] are the most reliable proofs of a bodily arrangement.

cf. Matt. x. 39

John vi. 39

cf. Matt. viii. 12

cf. Matt. x. 28, viii. 12

cf. Matt. xxii. 11

cf. Matt. xxii. 13

cf. Matt. xix. 28.

cf. Rev. ii. 7

36. Let us see now whether also in throwing down the cunning of the Sadducees he has the more elevated our cause. The motive of the inquiry, I fancy, was the destruction of resurrection,

[1] *Opertibus* is Kroymann's palmary emendation for *operibus* of the MSS.

[2] The true text *duodecim* from the Clairvaux MS.

[3] Note how Tertullian forces these figurative texts to bear a literal sense (cf. d'Alès, p. 250).

since the Sadducees admit the salvation neither of the soul nor of the flesh, and therefore, in the manner in which belief in resurrection is most of all undermined, in that manner they have adapted the argument to their riddle, namely that about the flesh, whether it was to marry or not after resurrection, under the character of the woman, concerning whom, as she had been married to seven brothers, they were in doubt as to which of them she would be restored. Now, let the thoughts behind the question and the answer alike be watched, and the dispute is settled. For since the Sadducees rejected[1] resurrection, while the Lord established it, upbraiding their ignorance of the Scriptures, I mean those that preached resurrection, and their unbelief in[2] the power of God, which is of course adequate to raise the dead again, by adding at last "that the dead, however, rise again," and definitely confirming what was denied, namely the resurrection of the dead, who then live with God,[3] He also proved that it was such as it was denied to be, namely that of both parts of man. For, if He denied that they would marry then, He did not therefore prove that they wou'd not rise again either. But indeed He calls them "sons of resurrection," as those that will in a sense be born through it,[4] after which they

cf. Matt. xxii. 23-28, etc.

cf. Matt. xxii. 29, etc.

Luke xx. 37

Luke xx. 36

[1] On *respuere*, cf. Hoppe, p. 184.
[2] For *incredulus* with the genitive, cf. Hoppe, p. 22.
[3] Or perhaps "in the presence of the God of the living," as Kroymann seems to take it, referring to Matt. xxii. 32.
[4] On *habere*, c. infin. = fut., cf. c. 30 and Hoppe, pp. 44 f.

will not marry, having been raised again. "For they shall be like the angels," as those who will not marry, because they will not die either, but as those who will also pass into the condition of angels through that garment of imperishableness, through a change of nature, which is nevertheless one that has been raised again.[1] But the question whether we were to marry or die again or not would not be asked, if the restoration of that part of man in particular were not called in question which properly experiences both death and marriage, namely the flesh. You have the Lord therefore establishing a complete[2] resurrection against the heretics among the Jews, whose denial of it is now shared by the Sadducees among the Christians. Luke xx. 36

37. Similarly, though He says that "the flesh does no good," the meaning must be determined from the subject matter of the phrase. For because they thought His "saying difficult" and unbearable, as if He had really appointed "His flesh to be eaten" by them, in order that He might assign salvation to the spiritual sphere, He preceded it with the words: "It is the spirit that makes alive," and then added: "The flesh can do no good," that is, of course, in the matter of life-giving. He also goes on to say what He means to be understood by "the spirit": "The words that I have spoken to you, are spirit, are life," cf. John vi. 63 cf. John vi. 60 cf. John vi. 52, 56 John vi. 63 John vi. 63 John vi. 63

[1] It is the same nature as before, though it has been changed.
[2] *i.e.* One both of body and soul.

John v. 24 just as above also: "He that hears my words and believes in Him that sent me, has everlasting life and will not come to be judged, but will pass from death to life." Therefore although He
cf. John vi. 63 lays it down that the word makes alive, since "the word is spirit and life," He also called His flesh
cf. John i. 14 by the same name, since "the word" also "had become flesh," the word which is equally to be sought for the sake of life, devoured by the hearing, chewed by the understanding, and digested by faith.[1] For a little earlier He had declared His
cf. John vi. 51 "flesh" to be also "heavenly bread," strongly[2] impressing on them by the allegory of necessary
cf. John vi. 31 diet the history of their "fathers," who had preferred the loaves and flesh of the Egyptians to the divine call. Therefore, turning to their reflexions, because He had felt they must be dispersed,
John vi. 63 He said: "The flesh does no good." What has that to do with destroying the resurrection of the flesh? As if there might not be something which, although it did no good, could yet get good from
cf. John vi. 63 something else! "The spirit" does good; for it
cf. John vi. 63 "makes alive." "The flesh does no good;" for it suffers death. Therefore in our view he rather set forth the purpose of both. For in showing what is beneficial and what is not beneficial, He at the same time made clear[3] which benefits

[1] On this daring preservation of the metaphor, cf. Hoppe, p. 182.

[2] "*Usque quaque,*" hoc est "multum": Ambr., expos. ps. 118, 1. § 18.

[3] On this construction with *inluminare*, cf. Hoppe, p. 189.

which,[1] namely the spirit the flesh, the life-giver that which has suffered death. "For the hour will come," He says, "when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live." What is "dead" but flesh? And what is "the voice of God" but the word? And what is "the word" but the spirit? It is right that He should raise the flesh again, for He himself "was made flesh," and from death, which He himself suffered, and from the tomb, into which He himself was borne. Further, when He says: "Wonder not, for the hour will come at which all that are in tombs will hear the voice of the Son of God, and those that have done good will come forth to a resurrection which is life, but those that have done evil, to a resurrection which is judgment," no one will really be able to interpret the dead "that are in tombs" as other than bodies and flesh, because even the tombs themselves are nothing but abodes of corpses. Even if "the old men" themselves, that is, sinners, that is, those that are dead through "ignorance of God," who, the heretics argue, are to be understood by the word "tombs," are clearly proclaimed as about "to come forth" from the tombs "to judgment," how will tombs "come forth" from tombs?[2]

John v. 15

cf. John i. 14

John v. 28, 29

cf. Col. iii. 9, etc.

cf. 1 Cor. xv. 34

38. Now that we have considered the Lord's words, what are we to believe is the meaning of

[1] On the double interrog., thus asyndetically employed, cf. Hoppe, p. 74.

[2] For this ending, cf. c. 1 and Hoppe, p. 156.

His deeds, in raising the dead again from biers and tombs? What was the good of this? If it was simply for the purpose of displaying his power or of conferring the immediate favour of restored life,[1] it was not so great a thing for Him to raise those that had to die afresh. In very truth, if it was rather in order to preserve the belief in a future resurrection, therefore the manner of the proof dictates[2] that it will be corporeal. Nor will I tolerate the statement that on those occasions a resurrection, designed for the soul only, penetrated[3] into the flesh also, because in no other way could the resurrection of an invisible soul have been shown than by the raising again of a visible substance. They know little of God that do not fancy Him capable of doing what does not enter their minds; and yet they know He was able, if they know John's book. For He who brought before the vision "the souls" of the martyrs, while they were still alone,[4] resting "under the altar," could of course present to the eyes fleshless souls rising again. But I prefer that God should be incapable of deceit, showing weakness only in trickery, lest the proofs He sent beforehand should appear to be different from His arrangement of the matter itself, nay rather, lest,

cf. Rev. vi. 9

[1] For *redanimatio*, cf. the note on c. 30 and Hoppe, p. 138, n.

[2] Meaning that as the *bodies* of the widow of Nain's son and of Lazarus were restored, so will it be with all at the last.

[3] I should read *percucurrisse* for the MSS. *praecucurrisse* ("preceded"); Kroymann's suggestion *procucurrisse* is not so easy palæographically.

[4] That is, not in conjunction with bodies.

if He was unable to bring on an instance of fleshless resurrection, He might be all the more unable to present the fulfilment of the example without the same material.[1] But no example is greater than that of which it is the example. It is, however, a greater thing that souls should be raised again with the body as a proof that they could rise again without the body, that the complete salvation of man should support half his salvation, since the character of the instances would rather demand what was considered less, I mean the resurrection of the soul, as a suggestion that the flesh also would rise again at[2] its proper season. And furthermore, according to our opinion of the truth,[3] those instances of the dead raised by the Lord really proved[4] the resurrection both of the flesh and of the soul, lest this gift should be denied to any part of man's nature: yet, as examples, they showed forth therefore something less than that: for these men were raised not for a life of glory or for imperishableness, but for[5] another death.

39. Which resurrection Christ made known is evidenced also by the writings concerning the apostles.[6] For the apostles also had no other

[1] *i.e.* The flesh: the true reading in the Clairvaux MS.
[2] On the superfluous *in*, see Hoppe, p. 31.
[3] I read *ueri* with Leopold; MSS. *uero*.
[4] For this sense of *commendare*, cf. c. 5 and Hoppe, p. 127.
[5] For these examples of "final" *in*, cf. Hoppe, p. 39.
[6] For Tertullian's view of the inspiration of the Scriptures, see d'Alès, pp. 221 f., and for the expression *apostolica instrumenta*, d'Alès, p. 223, and Harnack, *Beiträge zur Einl. in das N. T.* VI (Leipzig, 1914), p. 143.

business, at least in Israel,[1] than to unseal[2] the Old Testament and to seal[2] the New, and still more now to preach God in Christ. Thus they introduced nothing new concerning resurrection either, except that they preached it also to Christ's "glory," but[3] it was accepted by a simple and already well-known belief, without any questioning about its character, the only objectors being the Sadducees. It was much easier to deny the resurrection of the dead altogether than to understand it in any other way.[4] You find Paul before "the chief priests" under "the tribune" declaring his belief openly as between "Sadducees and Pharisees" thus: "Gentlemen, brethren, I am a Pharisee, a son of Pharisees, touching hope now and resurrection am I being tried before you;" he means of course their common resurrection, lest, because he was already regarded as a "transgressor of the law," he might be regarded as holding the views of the Sadducees with regard to a leading article of the whole creed, namely the resurrection. Thus he of course confirmed the belief in resurrection held by the Pharisees and declined to be regarded as tearing it up, while he spurned those who denied it, the Sadducees. In like manner also before Agrippa he said that he "was publishing

cf. Luke xxiv. 26

cf. Acts xxii. 29, 30

cf. Acts xx ii. 6 Acts xxiii. 6

cf. Rom. ii. 25, 27

cf. Acts xxvi. 22

[1] In other words: among the Jews.

[2] Note how the idea of a will (*testamentum*) with its seven seals closing as well as attesting it, is preserved in the language here. On *resignare* (metaph.), see Hoppe, p. 135.

[3] On *de cetero* = *ceterum*, see Hoppe, p. 101.

[4] Namely than that of body and soul together.

nothing other than[1] the prophets had preached." Therefore he also preserved resurrection such as the prophets had preached it. For in mentioning also a passage about "the resurrection" of the dead in "Moses," he knew it to be physical, at which of course a man's blood must[2] be "required." Therefore the resurrection he preached was such as the Pharisees also had adopted and the Lord himself had maintained, and the Sadducees, in order not to believe in it also, had absolutely repudiated. Even the Athenians had understood that no other sort of "resurrection" was set forth by Paul: for they had "ridiculed" it, and they would not have ridiculed it at all, if they had heard him mention a restoration of the soul merely; for they would have adopted what was a frequent tenet of their native philosophy. But when now the announcement[3] of a hitherto unheard-of kind of resurrection shook the nations by its very novelty, and the natural unbelief in so great a matter began to torture[4] faith with questionings, then the Apostle also through almost the whole of his writings took trouble to strengthen faith in this hope, showing both that it existed and that it had not yet been realised, and—and this was the matter that was most questioned—that it was physical, and—and this besides was doubted—that it was not other than physical.

cf. Acts xxvi. 23

cf. Gen. ix. 5

cf. Acts xvii. 32

[1] This use of *citra* is ignored by Hoppe, but is recorded in *Thes.* It is tempting to alter to *quod*.

[2] On this sense of *habere*, cf. cc. 22, 27 and Hoppe, p. 44.

[3] For this sense of *praeconium*, cf. Hoppe, p. 122.

[4] On this sense of *torquere*, see Hoppe, p. 192.

40. It is no wonder that even from his own writings[1] arguments are grasped at, "since heresies must exist"; and heresies could not exist if the Scriptures could not be understood wrongly as well as rightly. Thus, heresies finding two "men" spoken of by the Apostle, "an inner" (that is, the soul) and "an outer" (that is, the flesh), have assigned salvation to the soul (that is, "the inner man,") and destruction to the flesh (that is, "the outer man,") because it stands written to the Corinthians: "For even if our outer man perishes, yet[2] our inner is renewed day by day." But[3] neither is the soul by itself "man," being, as it is, afterwards inserted into the created thing now called man, nor is flesh without soul "man," which after the soul is exiled from it is entitled a corpse. Thus the name "man" is a sort of buckle[4] uniting two combined substances, under which name they cannot exist unless closely united. Again, the Apostle prefers that by the "inner man" should be understood not so much the soul as the mind and the spirit, that is, not the substance itself, but the intelligence of the substance. If when writing to the Ephesians he used the words that "Christ dwells in the inner man," he meant of course that the Lord must be made known to their intelligences. For he added: "through faith," and "in your hearts" and "in

cf. 1 Cor. xi. 19

cf. 2 Cor. iv. 16

2 Cor. iv. 16

cf. Gen. ii. 7

cf. 2 Cor. iv. 16

Eph. iii. 16, 17

Eph. iii. 17

[1] Cf. d'Alès, p. 222.

[2] For *sed* introducing the apodosis, after *etsi* in the principal clause, cf. cc. 14, 35, and Hoppe, p. 108.

[3] For *porro* = *at enim*, cf. Hoppe, p. 113.

[4] For this metaphor, cf. Hoppe, p. 174.

love," meaning faith and love not as innate, but as acquired[1] qualities of the soul, but when he said "in your hearts," which are really parts of flesh, he thus assigned also "the inner man" himself to flesh, when he placed him in the heart. Consider now how he declared that while "the outer man was perishing," "the inner man was yet being renewed day by day,"[2] lest you should identify the first with that corruption which the flesh experiences in its continuous waste from the day of death, instead of that which, in the span of this life before death and till death, it experienced[3] through harassments and tribulations, tortures and penalties for the sake of the Name. Even "the inner man" will have "to be renewed" here of course, through the Spirit's suggestions[4] progressing in faith and knowledge "day by day," not yonder, that is, not after resurrection, where we shall[5] not of course "be renewed day by day," but once for all at the end. Learn from what follows: "For that which is in the present, the temporal and trifling character of our tribulation, through excess into excess completes[6] for us an everlasting weight

Eph. iii. 17 cf. 2 Cor. iv. 16

cf. 2 Cor. iv. 16

cf. 2 Cor. iv. 16 cf. Eph. iv. 23, 24

cf. 2 Cor. iv. 16

cf. 2 Cor. iv. 16 2 Cor. iv. 17, 18

[1] On *conceptiuus* here, cf. Hoppe, p. 125.

[2] I cannot quite understand how Hoppe (p. 42) contends that these infinitives are equivalent to datives.

[3] *Experiretur* (Clairvaux MS.), the true text.

[4] Cf. Engelbrecht, in *Wiener Studien*, Bd. xxviii (1906), p. 157; Hoppe, p. 124, wrongly renders here "infusion."

[5] For *habere* indicating futurity, cf. cc. 30, 36, 40 (below) and Hoppe, p. 45.

[6] *perficit nobis*, Kroymann rightly; *perficit in nobis*, Clairvaux MS.; *perfici a nobis*, other MSS. This corruption would suggest that the archetype of our MSS. was in Visigothic script, for in it *t* would mostly naturally be read as *a*.

of glory, if we gaze not on visible things," that is, sufferings, "but on invisible things," that is rewards: "for what is seen is temporal, but what is not seen is eternal." For the tribulations and
2 Cor. iv. 15 injuries[1] by which "the outer man" is destroyed, as being trifling and temporal, he asserts are therefore to be lightly esteemed, holding before us
cf. 2 Cor. iv. 17 "the weight" of the everlasting invisible rewards and "of glory" as a compensation for the troubles which the flesh suffers here and is thereby destroyed. So far is it from being yonder corruption which
cf. 2 Cor. iv. 16 they assign to "the outer man" for the continual destruction of the flesh, to the driving out of
Rom. viii. 17, 18 resurrection. So also elsewhere he says: "Inasmuch as we suffer with Him, that we may be also glorified with Him: for I reckon that the sufferings of the present time are not worthy to be compared with the future glory that is to be[2] revealed in us."[3] Here also he shows that the troubles are less than their rewards. Again, if we suffer with Him in the flesh to which it properly belongs to be destroyed by sufferings, to it will belong also what is promised in return for our suffering with Him. And further, when about to assign to the flesh the special experience of tribulations, as above, he
2 Cor. vii. 5 says: "But when we had come into Macedonia, our flesh had no respite"; then, in order also to

[1] For the rime in *pressuras, laesuras*, cf. Hoppe, p. 163.

[2] For *habere* indicating the future, see the note above in this chapter.

[3] This text is given as an instance of Tertullian's inconstancy in the wording of scripture texts cited by him (d'Alès, p. 234, after Monceaux).

mention[1] the soul's fellow-suffering, he says: "In every respect crushed; battles without," warring to the death, against the flesh, of course, "dread within," tormenting the soul, of course. Thus, even though "the outer man" is being destroyed, his destruction should be understood not as loss of resurrection, but as endurance of harassment, and that too in conjunction with "the inner man." Thus to both will belong alike the fellowship of glory and the fellowship of suffering. They must run the course of the partnership in rewards just as they have gone through that of sufferings.[2] 2 Cor. vii. 5 cf. 2 Cor. iv. 16 cf. 2 Cor. iv. 16

41. He follows out the same thought further, setting the rewards before the torments: "For we know," he says, "that although the earthly house of our tabernacle is broken up, we have a house not made by hands, everlasting in the heavens," that is: in compensation for the breaking up of our flesh through sufferings, we shall attain a home in the heavens. He remembered the statement in the Gospel: "Happy are they that experience persecution because of righteousness, because theirs is the kingdom of heaven." He did not, however, deny the restoration of the flesh, though he added[3] the compensatory reward, since compensation is the due of the very part to which dissolution is ascribed, namely the flesh. But because he had 2 Cor. v. 1 Matt. v. 10

[1] I venture to think that *diceret* is nearer to the *daret* of the MSS. than *det* is, but *daret* may well be right.

[2] Note the alliteration in *collegia, consortia* and the rime in *laborum, praemiorum* (Hoppe, p. 167).

[3] I suggest *apposuit* as an improvement on *opposuit* of the MSS.

2 Cor. v. 1 called the flesh a "house," he wished to make a neat use of the word "house" in comparing the reward also, promising to the very "house which will be broken up" by suffering, a better "house" through resurrection. For the Lord also promises cf. John xiv. 2 "many habitations in the house," as it were, with the Father. And yet it can be understood also of the home which is the universe, on the destruc- cf. 2 Cor. v. 1 tion of which "an everlasting resting-place is promised in heaven," because what follows also, clearly referring to the flesh, shows that what precedes has no connexion with the flesh. For the Apostle makes a separation when he adds: 2 Cor. v. 2, 3 "For we also groan in this present home of ours, longing to put on us that which is from heaven; since[1] though stripped we shall not be found naked," that is: "we wish to put on the heavenly excellence of eternity before we are stripped of the flesh." For the privilege of this favour awaits those that at the Lord's arrival will be found in the flesh and on account of the severities of antichrist's time will deserve by an abbreviated death, accomplished[2] through change, to run by the side of those that are rising again, even as he writes 1 Thess. iv. 15–17 to the Thessalonians: "For this we say to you in the Lord's word, that we who are alive, who remain till the Lord's arrival, shall not precede them that have slept, since the Lord himself by

[1] For the causal force of *si quidem*, cf. cc. 12, 13, and Hoppe, p. 83.

[2] For *expungo*, see Hoppe, p. 132, and Mayor, Tert. *Apol.*, index.

the command and utterance of the trumpet of God shall descend from heaven, and they that have died in Christ shall rise again first; then we shall be snatched along with them in the clouds to meet Christ, and then we shall always be with Christ."[1]

42. The change which these undergo he explains in writing to the Corinthians: "We shall not all rise again, but we shall all be changed,[2] in a second, in a momentary movement of the eye, at the last bugle." [But of course only those who shall be found "in the flesh": "and the dead," he says, "shall rise again, we shall be changed."] When you have first, therefore, examined[3] this affirmation you will recall the rest to the first thought. For when he adds: "For this corruptible must put on incorruption and this mortal must put on immortality," this will be "that home from heaven which while we groan in this flesh we long to put on," of course above the flesh in which we shall be found,[4] because he says "we who are in the tabernacle are weighed down, because we are unwilling to be stript and desire rather to be clothed upon, that the mortal may be swallowed

1 Cor. xv. 51, 52

cf. 1 Cor. xv. 51

1 Cor. xv. 53

cf. 2 Cor. v. 2, 4

[1] Read *Christo* of the MSS. here (see the textual evidence in Tischendorf, *ad loc.*); I cannot understand why Kroymann here prefers *domino*, the Vulgate reading. The ending *domino erimus* (⏑⏑–⏑⏑) is one of which Hoppe (p. 157) gives only three other examples yet he gives none of *Christo erimus* (––⏑⏑).

[2] This reading is due to what seems a necessary emendation of Kroymann, but it is unique; the MSS. give the "Western" reading; see my critical apparatus to Greek New Testament. The context involves the bracketing of the passage below.

[3] *Perspecta*, Kroymann, for *prospecta* of the MSS., rightly: again a Visigothic archetype is suggested; see above p. 97, n. 6.

[4] The word carries the idea "surprised," "caught" (in the act).

by life," assuredly when we are changed, putting on what is from heaven. For who will not long, while he is in the flesh, to put on immortality and to continue life, death being turned to profit through a substitutionary change, lest he should have experience of the world below, which will exact up to "the last penny" from him?[1] But after he has already experienced the lower world, he will attain a change even after resurrection. For from now we lay it down that the flesh will in every respect [rise again and] as the result of the change that is to come upon it, will assume an angelic appearance. Either if in these only "who shall be found" in the flesh, it will have to be changed, that the "mortal may be swallowed up by life," that is the flesh, by that heavenly, everlasting garment; therefore those who shall be found dead, shall not attain life, as they have already been deprived of the material and, so to speak, the food of life, that is, the flesh, or else it is inevitable that they also should receive it, that in them also "the mortal may be swallowed up by life," if life they are to attain. "But in the dead," you say, "this mortal will already have been swallowed up." Certainly not in all. For how many[2] may be found just one day dead, corpses so fresh that nothing in them can seem to have been swallowed up? For by "swallowed up" of

cf. Matt. v. 26, etc.

cf. Luke xx. 36
2 Cor. v. 3, 4

2 Cor. v. 4

[1] This is a foreshadowing of purgatory, though the word is not used (cf. d'Alès, p. 133, where other passages of similar trend are quoted).

[2] For *quanti* = *quot*, cf. Hoppe, p. 106.

course you mean nothing else but cut off, blotted out, snatched away from all feeling, that which has entirely vanished. Even the ancient corpses of the giants it will be admitted have not been swallowed up, since their skeletons still live. We have spoken of this already elsewhere. But recently also in this city,[1] at the laying of the foundations of the Odeon, disgraced[2] by so many old graves, the citizens were horrified at the sight of bones about five hundred years old still fresh, and at the odour of the hair. It is well-known not only that bones last, but also that teeth continue entire; they are kept as seeds[3] of the body that will sprout at the resurrection. Finally, although "the mortal" will then be found "swallowed up" in all mortals, it is assuredly by death, assuredly by time, assuredly through age: is it ever by life, is it by the garment put on, is it by the bestowal of immortality? Further, he who says that the mortal will be swallowed by these, denied that it would be by others. And of course it will be fitting that this should be carried out and offered[4] to us by divine strength, not by natural laws. Therefore, since "what is mortal will[5] be swallowed up by life," it must be presented in every way, in order to be swallowed up,

cf. *De Anima*, 51

cf. 2 Cor. v. 4

cf. 2 Cor. v. 4

[1] *i.e.* Carthage, cf. *Apol.* 16 (p. 54, l. 27, ed. Mayor) *in ista proxime ciuitate.*

[2] For *sacrilegus* with the genitive, cf. Hoppe, p. 24.

[3] For this simile, cf. Hoppe, p. 194.

[4] For the alliteration in *perfici, praestari*, cf. Hoppe, p. 152.

[5] For *habere* indicating futurity, cf. cc. 30, 36, 40 and Hoppe, p. 45.

and be swallowed up in order to be changed. If you say a fire must be lit, you cannot declare that the means of lighting it is necessary in one place, unnecessary in another. So also when he
2 Cor. v. 3 adds:[1] "Inasmuch as though stript, we be not found bare," concerning those of course who shall be surprised by the Day of the Lord neither in life nor in the flesh, elsewhere he has not denied that those are to be bare who he has prophesied will be stript, except that he wished they should be understood to be also reclothed with the same substance as that of which they had been stript. For as bare they will be found, with the flesh laid aside or in part rent or rubbed off—this too can be styled bareness,—then they will recover it, in order that when reclothed[2] with flesh they may
cf. 2 Cor. v. 2 also become "clothed upon" with immortality. For it will, then, be impossible for any one to
cf. 2 Cor. v. 2 be "clothed upon" unless he has been already clothed.[3]

2 Cor. v. 6, 7 43. Likewise when he says: "Therefore always trusting and knowing that, when we are lingering in the body, we are far away from the Lord; for we walk by faith, not by sight," it is clear that this too is in no way intended to degrade[4] the flesh, which as it were separates us from the Lord. For

[1] On *infulcire* see Postgate's important Appendix B in his *Select Elegies of Propertius*, 2nd ed. (London, 1885).

[2] For these examples of the so-called Greek accusative, see Hoppe, p. 17.

[3] For this ending, see c. 19 and Hoppe, p. 156.

[4] For the metaphorical use of *offuscatio, offuscare*, cf. Hoppe, pp. 133, 190.

here also there meets us encouragement to disdain this present life, since "we are far away from the Lord" as long as we are alive, "walking by faith, not by sight," that is in hope, not realisation.[1] And therefore he adds: "But trusting and thinking it a good thing rather to be far away from the body and to dwell near the Lord," of course in order that we may "walk more by sight than by faith," by reality rather than by hope. You see how here also he refers contempt for bodies to the standard of excellence of martyrdoms. For no one who "has journeyed away from the body," dwells immediately with the Lord, unless he is to turn aside thither from the privilege of martyrdom, paradise of course, not the lower world. But had words failed the Apostle to indicate departure from the body? Or does he use novel language actually of set purpose? Wishing to indicate temporal absence from "the body," he said that "we are far away from" it, since he who will go on a journey will also return home. Then he also says to all: "We are eager, whether abroad or at home, to be pleasing to God; for we must all be revealed before the tribunal of Christ Jesus." If "all," then also in our entirety; if in our entirety, then both our outside and our inside, that is souls and bodies alike: "in order that each," he says, "may bring back what was in the body, according to what he did, good or evil." I now ask how you read this. For he has built up his clause

2 Cor. v. 6 cf. 2 Cor. v. 7

2 Cor. v. 8 cf. 2 Cor. v. 7

2 Cor. v. 9, 10 cf. 2 Cor. iv. 16 2 Cor. v. 10

[1] For the rime, *spe, re*, cf. Hoppe, pp. 163 f.

somewhat confusedly, using transposition of words.
2 Cor. v. 10 Whether is it "those things which through the body" will have to be brought back, or[1] those "which 'were done' through the body"? But if it be those things which have to be brought back "through the body," resurrection is undoubtedly bodily: and if it be those things that were done "through the body," they must of course be paid "through the body," through which they were also done. Thus also this whole discussion of the Apostle from the beginning, completed[2] with such a conclusion as shows the resurrection of the flesh, will have to be understood in accordance with principles that harmonize with the end.

(= c. 40) cf. 2 Cor. iv. 16 44. If you look back also to the passage above from which the mention of "the outer" and "inner man" was introduced, will you not find both the high rank and the hope of the flesh unimpaired? For when with reference to the light which God had
2 Cor. iv. 6 caused to shine "in our hearts to shed light on the recognition of" His "glory in the person of
cf. 2 Cor. iv. 7 Christ," he says that "we have this treasure in earthen vessels," namely in the flesh: whether, because it is "earthen" according to its origin in clay, will it be destroyed, or,[3] because it is the receptacle of the divine treasure, will it be exalted?
cf. John i. 9; cf. 2 Cor. ii. 10 But indeed if that "true light" itself which is "in the person of Christ," contains life in itself, and

[1] For *utrumne—an*, cf. Hoppe, p. 73.
[2] For *detexere* in this sense, cf. Hoppe, p. 192.
[3] On *utrumne—an*, cf. c. 43 and Hoppe, p. 73.

that life is entrusted with light to the flesh, shall that perish into which the life is entrusted? Certainly it would be so. Is the treasure itself also to perish? For perishable objects are entrusted to perishable, as "new wine" is entrusted to "old wine-skins." cf. Matt. ix. 17, etc. Also when he adds: "Always carrying about in 2 Cor. iv. 10 our body the dying of Christ Jesus." What sort of a thing is this which after being "a temple of cf. 1 Cor. iii. 16 God," can now also be called a tomb of Christ? Why, moreover, "do we carry about the death cf. 2 Cor. iv. 10 of the Lord in the body"? "That the life 2 Cor. iv. 11 also," he says, "may be manifested." Where? "In the body." In what body? "In the mortal body." Therefore in the flesh, which is clearly mortal in respect to guilt, but is also full of life in respect to grace; consider how full it must be "that the life" of Christ "may be manifested" in 2 Cor. iv. 11 it. Shall "the life of Christ" then, everlasting, continuous, indestructible, which is now also the life of God, be manifested in a thing strange to[1] salvation, in a substance which is being continuously broken up? Or to what season will "the life" of the Lord belong that is to be "manifested 2 Cor. iv. 11 in our body"? The life indeed which He lived till His Passion, was not only quite public[2] among the Jews, but has also now been published to all nations. To such a degree does he indicate that life which "burst open the adamantine portals of cf. Ps. cvi. 16 death and the bronze bars" of the world below,

[1] For *alienus* with the genitive, cf. Hoppe, p. 21.
[2] For this adjectival type of phrase, see Hoppe, p. 100.

cf. 2 Cor. iv. 11

which is thus ours now. For it will "be manifested in the body." When? After death. How? When we rise again in the body, even as also Christ did. For lest any one should argue that

cf. 2 Cor. iv. 11

the life of Jesus must now be "manifested in our body" through the training in holiness and endurance and righteousness and wisdom in which the Lord's life abounded, the thoughtful purpose of the

2 Cor. iv 11

Apostle adds:[1] "For if we who live, are handed over to death for Jesus' sake, let His life also be manifested in our mortal body." Thus he says this will happen in our body when we are dead. But if *then*, how, unless it has been raised again?

2 Cor. iv. 14

In like manner also at the end he says: "Knowing that He who raised Jesus will raise us too along with Him," because He has already risen again from the dead, unless because "along with Him" has the sense of "even as Him"; but if "even as Him," not of course without flesh.

45. But once again by reason of a different blindness they clash[2] with the two men, with

cf. Eph. iv. 22–24, etc.

"the old" and with "the new," the Apostle warning us "to lay aside the old man who is being

cf. Eph. iv. 22–24

destroyed through misleading desire, and to be renewed in the spirit of our understanding and to put on the new man who is divinely created in righteousness and true worship," in order that here also, making a distinction according to two substances, old age with respect to the flesh, newness

[1] For this sense of *ingerere*, cf. Hoppe, p. 133.
[2] For this intransitive *impingere*, cf. Hoppe, p. 133.

with respect to the soul, they may claim lasting destruction for the old, that is the flesh. Again, if it is regulated by substances, neither is the soul "the new man" for the reason that it is later, nor the flesh "the old" for the reason that it is earlier. How little time passes between the application of the hand of God and His breath?[1] I should venture to say this: even if the flesh was much earlier than the soul, He made it first, for the very reason that it expected that it should be filled with the soul. For all accomplishment and completion, although it is later in time, is earlier in the effect. That is rather to be regarded as first without which the really earlier cannot take place.[2] If the flesh is the "old man," when was this created? From the beginning? But Adam was entirely new, and no old person comes from a new. For even from the time of the blessing given to creation, flesh and soul are produced together without a time calculation, since[3] they are also sown together in the womb, as we taught in the work on the soul. They coincide in time at conception, their age agrees at birth. These two men who are certainly of two substances, though not also of two ages, are thus produced as one, since neither is earlier than the other. It is a more correct view that the whole of us is either old

cf. Eph. iv. 24
cf. Eph. iv. 22
cf. Eph. iv. 22
cf. *De Anima*, 27

[1] Meaning, between the time when the hand was used to mould man's flesh, and the breath was used to infuse his soul into the body.

[2] For the absolute *posse*, cf. Hoppe, p. 144, and the use of "can" in Shakespeare, etc.

[3] For *ut qui* causal, yet with the indicative, cf. Hoppe, p. 74.

or new; for we do not know how we can be merely one of the two. But the Apostle clearly designates "the old man." For "cast off,"[1] he says, "the old man shown in your former manner of life," not shown in the age of some substance or other. Nor indeed does he instruct us "to cast off" the flesh, but those characteristics which he elsewhere also shows to be fleshly, blaming "works," not bodies,[2] concerning which here also he adds: "Lay aside lying and speak truth each to his neighbour, since we are members one of another.[3] And if you get angry, see that it is without sin. Let not the sun set upon your angry mood. And yield no ground to the devil. He who used to thieve, must thieve no more, let him much rather toil, working with his hands, that he may have something to share with the needy one. Let no foul language proceed from your mouth, but that which is good[4] for building up faith, that it may communicate graciousness to the hearers. And grieve not the Holy Spirit of God with which you were sealed on the day of your redemption. Let all bitterness and anger and shouting and evil-speaking be removed from you along with every kind of wickedness. And be kind and merciful to

cf. Eph. iv. 22
Eph. iv. 22
cf. Gal. v. 19
Eph. iv. 25–32

[1] For *exponere* in this developed sense, see Hoppe, p. 132.

[2] For the play upon words, *opera*, *corpora*, cf. cc. 8, 10, 12, and Hoppe, p. 169.

[3] For the adverbial *alterutrum* indicating reciprocity, cf. Hoppe, p. 103.

[4] ἀγαθός: the positive in the Greek Bible is often translated by the superlative in Latin. The Latin superlative had become weak in force at a very early date.

one another,[1] forgiving one another,[2] even as God also has forgiven you through Christ." Therefore why do not those who think "the old man" is flesh, hasten death for themselves, that by "casting off the old man" they may obey the Apostle's commands? But[3] we who believe[4] that the whole of faith must be put into practice in the flesh, nay rather even through the flesh, to which belongs both the mouth to bring forth every good speech, and the tongue to refrain from evil-speaking, and the feeling to refrain from wrath and the hand to work and dispense bounty, maintain that the expressions "old man" and "new man" alike refer to a moral difference, not a difference of substance. And thus we recognise that the same man who was "old according to his former manner of life," is also said to be destroyed in virtue of misleading desire, exactly in the same way as "the old man in virtue of his former manner of life," not in virtue of flesh through a lasting destruction, but in flesh just as much saved as he is identical, since it is an evil manner[5] of life, and not a bodily quality of which he has been stripped.[6]

cf. Eph. iv. 22
cf. Eph. iv. 22
cf. Eph. iv. 22, 24
cf. Eph. iv. 22
cf. Eph. iv. 22

46. Such would you everywhere recognise the

[1] For *in alterutrum*, cf. Hoppe, p. 104.
[2] For *inuicem* indicating reciprocal action, cf. Hoppe, p. 103.
[3] MSS. *enim*: whether we alter to *autem* or not, the sense seems best brought out by an adversative here. The *enim* might be defended as like the "elliptical" *nam*.
[4] For *credidi* = *credo*, see Löfstedt, *Zur Sprache Tertullians* (Lund, 1920), pp. 91 f.
[5] For the so-called Greek accusative, cf. cc. 7, 26, etc., and Hoppe, p. 17.
[6] For this ending, cf. c. 1 and Hoppe, p. 156.

Apostle to be, condemning the works of the flesh in such a way as to seem to condemn the flesh, but taking care that no one should think he really does this, by bringing forward[1] different or connected thoughts. For when he also says that "they that are in the flesh cannot please God," he immediately recalls them from a wrong to a sound understanding, by adding: "But *you* are not in the flesh, but in the spirit." In denying that those who were admittedly in the flesh, were "in the flesh," he showed that they were not in the works of the flesh, and thus besides that they and they only "could not please God," not meaning those who were in the flesh, but those that lived in a fleshly way, while those did "please God," who though they were "in the flesh," walked according to the spirit. And again he speaks of "the body" indeed as "dead," but on account of sin, even as "the spirit is life" on account of righteousness. When, moreover, he contrasted life with death, which is in the flesh, he there also undoubtedly promised life as the result of righteousness, where he appointed death as the result of sin. But it was in vain that he contrasted life with death, if it is not in the same sphere as that itself with which he contrasted it, which has of course to be shut out from the body. Again, if life shuts death out of the body, it cannot accomplish that unless it penetrate* to the place where that is

cf Rom. viii. 8

Rom. viii. 9

cf. Rom. viii. 10

[1] *Suggestus* here = *commemoratio* (Engelbrecht in *Wiener Studien*, Bd. xxviii [1906], p. 157), cf. Hoppe, p. 124.

which it shuts out. And why should I speak[1] of it obscurely, when the Apostle speaks[1] of it clearly? "For if," he says, "the Spirit of Him who raised Jesus, dwells in you, He who raised Jesus from the dead will raise your mortal bodies also by reason of His Spirit dwelling in you," so that even if one take the view that "the mortal body" is the soul, since he cannot deny that it is the flesh also, he is compelled to recognise the resurrection of the flesh also, in virtue of its share in the same condition. From what follows also you may learn that the works of the flesh are condemned, not the flesh itself: "Therefore, brethren," he says, "we are debtors not to the flesh to live <according to the flesh>; if you live according to the flesh, you will die; but if by the Spirit you have killed the doings of the flesh, you will live." Again, to answer each single point, if to those in the flesh, who yet are living according to the spirit, salvation is promised,[2] then not the flesh, but the working of the flesh opposes salvation. But if the working of the flesh is shut out, which is the cause of death, the flesh is proved to be saved, having nothing to do with the cause of death. "For the law," he says, "of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus has liberated thee[3] from the law of sin and death," of course "the law" which he said before "dwelt"[4] in our members. Therefore now our members will not be held fast

Rom. viii. 11

Rom. viii. 12, 13

Rom. viii. 2

cf. Rom. vii. 23

[1] For the omission of the word of speaking, cf. Hoppe, p. 145.
[2] On this important passage, see d'Alès, p. 267.
[3] Reading *te* with Clairvaux MS., confirmed by *De pudic.* 17.
[4] Hoppe, p. 43, takes this wrongly.

cf. Rom. viii. 2 cf. Rom. viii. 2 Rom. viii. 3

by "the law[1] of death," because they are not held by the "law of sin" either, having been "liberated" from both. "For the weak element in the law being that in which it was made weak through the flesh, God, sending His Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and through sin, condemned sin in the flesh," not the flesh in sin; for the house will not be condemned along with its occupant. He said that "sin *dwells* in our body." Moreover, sin having been condemned, the flesh is acquitted, just as though uncondemned it has been fettered to "the law of sin and death." So, although he called "the mind of the flesh death," and hence "enmity towards God," yet he did not call the flesh itself by that name. "What therefore," you say, "will be charged with the mind of the flesh, if not its substance itself?" Quite right, if you first prove that the flesh has some knowledge of its own. But if there is no knowledge of anything without the soul, understand that the knowledge of the flesh must be attributed to the soul, though it is sometimes attributed to the flesh, because it is managed on account of the flesh and through the flesh. And therefore he says that "sin dwells in the flesh," because the soul also, by which sin is introduced, is a lodger in the flesh, which is of course dead, but not because of itself, because of sin.[2] For elsewhere also he says: "How do you even now, as if you lived in the world, give your vote?"

cf. Rom. vii. 17

cf. Rom. viii. 2

cf. Rom. viii. 6, 7

cf. Rom. vii. 17

Col. ii. 20

[1] Reading *lege* of the MSS., which Kroymann alters to *legi*.
[2] For *nomine* = *causā*, cf. cc. 16, 28, 30, and Hoppe, p. 30.

not when writing to the dead, but to those who ought to cease to live in a worldly fashion.[1]

47. And a worldly life may[2] be that which he calls "the old man crucified with Christ," and not a quality of the body, but a moral quality.[3] But if we do not accept this view, our bodily quality is not crucified, nor has our flesh endured all the suffering of Christ's cross, but even as he added: "That the body of sin may be made of none effect," through the improvement of life, not through the destruction of substance, even as he says: "That up to this point we are slaves to sin" and that in this way "having died with Christ it may be believed that we shall also live with Him." For "so also," he says, "reckon that you are indeed dead." To what? To the flesh? No, but to sin. Therefore they will be alive to the flesh, but living for God in Christ Jesus, through the flesh of course, to which they shall not be dead, dead to sin of course, not to the flesh. For he adds[4] yet further: "Therefore let not sin rule in your mortal body, to obey it and to offer your bodies as weapons of unrighteousness to sin: but offer your very selves to God as those that are alive after being dead"—not merely as alive, but "as alive after being dead"—"and your bodies as weapons of righteousness."

Rom. vi. 6
Rom. vi. 6
Rom. vi. 6
cf. Rom. vi. 8
Rom. vi. 11
Rom. vi. 12, 13

[1] For the ending, cf. c. 2, and Hoppe, p. 157.

[2] For the future, where a "potential" might be expected, cf. cc. 7, 27, and Hoppe, p. 64.

[3] Kroymann rejects *sed moralitatem*, but surely the words are sufficiently defended by c. 45, *ad moralem, non ad substantialem, differentiam pertinere*.

[4] For *ingerere* in this sense, cf. c. 44, and Hoppe, p. 133.

Rom. vi. 19–23

And again: "Even as you offered your bodies as servants of uncleanness and unrighteousness to work unrighteousness, so also now offer your bodies as servants of righteousness to work holiness; for when you were slaves of sin, you were free in regard to righteousness. What profit, therefore, had you touching those things of which you are now ashamed? Their end is death. But now having been freed from sin, but enslaved to God, you have your profit unto sanctification, and the end everlasting life. For the payment of sin is death, but the largess of God is life everlasting in Christ Jesus, our Lord." Thus through all this succession of thoughts, wrenching away our bodies from unrighteousness and sin and uniting them to righteousness and holiness, and removing them from the payment of death to the largess of eternal life, it is to the flesh of course that he promises the reward of salvation, for it would have been quite unfitting [1] to demand from it any special life at all of holiness and righteousness, if it itself were not also to get the reward of that life, nor would it have been fitting that baptism itself should be carried out, if through regeneration it were not started on its way to restoration also, since the Apostle adds this too:

Rom. vi. 3, 4

"Know you not that such of us as have been baptized into Jesus, have been baptized into His death? We have therefore been buried along with Him through baptism into death, that, even as Christ rose from the dead, so we also may walk in newness

[1] For *competere* with accus. and infin., cf. Hoppe, p. 48.

of life." And lest you should think that this was said about the present life only, which from faith through baptism must be lived in newness, he added with forethought: "For if we have been sown together with the likeness of Christ's death, we[1] shall belong to the resurrection also." For we die symbolically in baptism, but we actually rise again in the flesh, even as also Christ, "that just as sin ruled in death, so also may grace rule through righteousness unto everlasting life through Jesus Christ our Lord." How "so," if not equally in the flesh? For where there is death, there also there is life after death, because life was also previously in the place where death was afterwards. For if the kingdom of death works nothing but the destruction of the flesh, in like manner life which is opposed to death, should work the opposite, that is, renewal of the flesh, that, even as "death by gaining strength had swallowed" up the mortal, so also, having been swallowed up by immortality, it may be able to hear the words: "Where, death, is thy goad? where, death, is thy strife?"[2] For so also will "grace superabound there, where unrighteousness also has abounded": so also shall "strength be made complete in weakness," saving that which has been lost, making alive what was dead, healing what was wounded, curing what was sick, buying back what was snatched away, freeing

Rom. vi. 5

Rom. v. 21

cf. Isa. xxv. 8

1 Cor. xv. 55

cf. Rom. v. 20

cf. 2 Cor. xii. 9

cf. Ezek. xxxiv. 16

[1] Reading *sed* with Clairvaux MS., confirmed by *De pudic.* 17.

[2] An interesting translation, from *νεῖκος*, not from *νῖκος* (victory); the two words were doubtless pronounced, as often written, the same in N.T. times.

what was in slavery, calling back what was misled, raising up what was dashed down; and indeed from earth to "heaven," where the Philippians also learn from the Apostle that "our citizenship is, whence also we expect our Saviour Jesus Christ, who will transform the body of our humility into the form of the body of His glory," assuredly after resurrection, for not even Christ himself was glorified before His passion. These will be our "bodies" which he beseeches the Romans "to offer, a victim living, holy, pleasing to God." How "living," if they are to perish? How "holy," if they are unholy? How "pleasing," if they are condemned? Come now, how will these eschewers of Scripture's light take what I think must have been written to the Thessalonians by a ray of the sun itself[1]—it is so clear; "and may the God of peace Himself sanctify you wholly"? Is it not enough? But these words follow: "and may your whole body and soul and spirit[2] be preserved blameless in the presence of the Lord." There you have every part of man destined for salvation, and at no other time but "at the coming of the Lord," who is "the key"[3] of resurrection.

cf. Phil. iii. 20

Phil. iii. 21

cf. Rom. xii. 1

1 Thess. v. 23

1 Thess. v. 23

1 Thess. v. 23 cf. Rev. i. 18

48. But "flesh," you say, "and blood cannot possess the Kingdom of God for an inheritance."[4] We know that this also is written, but we have

1 Cor. xv. 50

[1] On this striking expression, see Hoppe, p. 176.

[2] It has been noted that this is an inversion of the usual order, "spirit, body, soul," in this verse (d'Alès, p. 242).

[3] For this metaphor, cf. Hoppe, p. 214.

[4] In these chapters Tertullian gives two interpretations of this verse (cf. d'Alès, p. 253).

purposely postponed it to this point, that what our adversaries oppose to us at the very beginning of the battle, we may overthrow at the last conflict, when we have first overthrown all questionings which were so to speak its auxiliaries.[1] But now it will be convenient to take stock of what precedes, that its origin may prejudice to this thought also. To my thinking, the Apostle, after setting before the Corinthians every varied aspect of church life, had brought to an end his summing-up both of his own Gospel and of their faith by commending the Lord's death and resurrection, in order that he might trace the foundation of our hope also back to its real origin. Therefore he adds: "But if it is preached that Christ rose from the dead, how do certain people say among you that there is no resurrection of the dead? If there is not, neither did Christ rise again. If Christ did not rise again, our preaching is vain, our faith is vain. For we shall be found false witnesses to God, who have given evidence that He raised Christ again, whom He did not raise again. For if the dead do not rise again, neither did Christ rise again. If Christ did not rise again, your faith is vain, because you are still in your sins, and those who have slept in Christ have perished." What does he appear to be building us up to believe[2] by these words? "Resurrection," you say, "of the dead, which was denied." "Assuredly

1 Cor. xv. 12–18

[1] For the bellicose language here, cf. Hoppe, p. 204.
[2] For the dative of the gerundive here, cf. Hoppe, p. 55.

he wished it to be believed by the example of the Lord's resurrection." "Quite right," you say, "but is the example produced from difference or from equality?" "Of course," you say, "from equality." But how did Christ rise again? In the flesh or not? Without doubt, if you hear that He "was dead," that "He was buried according to the Scriptures" not otherwise than in the flesh, you will admit that He was equally raised again in the flesh. For there rose again the very thing that fell in death, that lay in the tomb, being not so much Christ in the flesh as the flesh in Christ. Therefore, if we shall rise again after the example of Christ who rose again in the flesh, we shall not rise again after the example of Christ, if we do not ourselves also rise again in the flesh: "because through a man," he says, "came death, and through a man resurrection," that he might of course separate the originators, Adam of death, Christ of resurrection, and might establish a resurrection of the same substance as that to which death also belongs, by a comparison of the originators themselves under the name "man." For if "even as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive," "they shall be made alive" in the flesh "in Christ," just as "in Adam they die" in the flesh. "But each in his own order," of course because also in his own body. For the order will be arranged according to deserts. But since merits are assigned also to the body, the order, too, of bodies must be arranged, that the order

cf. 1 Cor. xv. 3, 4

1 Cor. xv. 21

1 Cor. xv. 22

1 Cor. xv. 23

of deserts may be. If, moreover, there are also some people "that are baptized in place of the dead,"[1] we shall see whether that is reasonable. Assuredly he indicates that they established this custom because of the belief they held that a vicarious baptism would benefit even another flesh in the hope of resurrection, and only a physical resurrection could be sealed in a physical baptism. Why does he say that they themselves also "are baptized," that is * * if it is not the bodies that are baptized which rise again? For the soul is dedicated not by washing, but by answering.[2] "Why are we also," he says, "in danger every hour?" Of course, because of the flesh. "I am dying daily"; of course, because of risks to the flesh, by means of which he also "fought to the death with wild beasts at Ephesus," those beasts of course who brought about "the tribulation in Asia," about which he writes in the second epistle to the same (Corinthians): "For we would not have you ignorant, brethren, concerning our tribulation in Asia, that we were most exceedingly[3] burdened beyond[4] our strength, so as to be in doubt even about life." All this, if I mistake not, he enumerates with this purpose, that, being

cf. 1 Cor. xv. 29

cf. 1 Cor. xv. 29

1 Cor. xv. 30

1 Cor. xv. 31

cf. 1 Cor. xv. 32

cf. 2 Cor. i. 8

2 Cor. i. 8

[1] See d'Alès, p. 336.

[2] This is a reference to the questions and answers in the baptismal formula; cf. "The Ministration of Baptism to such as are of riper years," and C. H. Turner, *The History and Use of Creeds*, etc. Ch. Hist. Soc., 85 (S.P.C.K.), chap. 1. Washing concerns the body, he means.

[3] *Super quam supra*, almost un-Latin (= καθ' ὑπερβολήν).

[4] For this sense of *citra*, cf. Hoppe, p. 37.

unwilling that the struggle of the flesh should be believed vain, he wishes that the resurrection of the flesh should be believed without hesitation. For the struggle of that which will have no resurrection must be regarded as vain. "But
1 Cor. xv. 35 some one will say: 'How shall the dead rise again? And with what body will they come?'" Now, at this point he discusses the natures of bodies, whether it is the very same or different bodies that are taken again. But since an enquiry of that sort must be regarded as coming later, it will meantime be enough, from this reasoning also, that the resurrection should be defined as physical, when the character of bodies is being enquired into.[1]

49. We have come now to the question of flesh and blood, which is the real subject[2] of the whole enquiry. It is equally possible to learn from what precedes what substances the Apostle has outlawed from the kingdom of God, and what are their
1 Cor. xv. 47 natures.[3] "The first man," he says, "was from the earth, *choicus*,"[4] that is made of clay, that is
Rev. xix. 13 Adam, "the second Man is from heaven," that is "the Word of God," that is Christ, who is, however, in no other way "man," although from heaven, except that He also is flesh and soul, as man is, as Adam was. For although He is called

[1] For this ending, cf. c. 2 and Hoppe, p. 157.
[2] I venture to read *rem ueram* for the MSS. *re uera*.
[3] Read *conditione* with Clairvaux MS.
[4] It appears that the oldest Latin Bible simply transliterated the Greek word χοικός. When we come to the Cyprianic Bible, it is already *de limo*. The Vulgate, etc. have *terrenus*.

above "the last Adam," it was from the partnership in substance that he drew his participation in the name, because Adam, like Christ, was not flesh from seed. "As," therefore, "is the *choicus*, so also are the *choici*, as is the heavenly one, so also are the heavenly ones." Does this mean "so" in substance, or firstly in manner of life, thereafter also in honour, which their manner of life has seized? But indeed in substance "the *choici* and the heavenly" will be in no way separated, having been once called "men" by the Apostle. For if Christ also, the only truly "heavenly" one, nay rather even more than heavenly, yet man in virtue of flesh and soul, is, as the result of this nature of substances,[1] in no way distinguished from the *choic* character, in like manner also, those that are "heavenly" after his pattern will be understood as having been proclaimed "heavenly," not with respect to their present substance, but with respect to their future glory, because even formerly—whence this distinction proceeded — as regards difference in honour there was shown to be "one glory of those in the heavens, another of those on the earth," and "one of the sun, another of the moon, another of the stars, because star also differs from star in glory," yet not in substance. For in first mentioning the difference of honour in the same material, an honour which must now be sought

cf. 1 Cor. xv. 45

1 Cor. xv. 48

1 Cor. xv. 40, 41

[1] Meaning the possession of flesh and soul, like any ordinary human being.

after and must then be enjoyed, he adds also an exhortation, that both here we should imitate the mien of Christ by our life and should there attain
1 Cor. xv. 49 the summit in glory: "Even as we have borne the likeness of the *choic*, let us also bear the likeness of the heavenly." For we have borne the likeness of the *choic* through fellowship in sin,[1] through partnership in death, through exile from paradise For if even in the flesh here is borne the likeness
cf. Eph. iv. 22 of Adam, yet we are not advised "to cast off"[2] the flesh: and if not the flesh, therefore it is the manner of life, that in like manner also we may bear "the likeness of the heavenly" in us, not yet of God nor yet of one in heaven, but walking
Eph. iv. 24 according to the pattern of Christ "in holiness and righteousness and truth." And to such a degree does he aim all this teaching at our manner of life, that he says the likeness of Christ must be borne here in this flesh and in this period of our training. For in using the words "let us bear" in the manner of an instructor, he is speaking to the present time in which man is of no other material than flesh and soul, or else even if this faith has in view any other, that is an heavenly, substance, yet it is promised here to that which is instructed to work hard to that end. When therefore he fixes the likeness both of the *choic* and of the heavenly in manner of life, saying that the former is to be foresworn but the latter cultivated, and then adds:

[1] For *transgressio*, cf. Hoppe, p. 125.
[2] For *exponere* thus used, cf. c. 45 and Hoppe, p. 132.

"For this I say,"—that is, because of what I said above; moreover for that reason there is an unity of thought furnishing a complement to what precedes—"that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God," he commands that "flesh and blood" should be understood in no other sense than the previously mentioned "likeness of the *choic*." And if this is deemed to mean the old manner of life,[1] and if the old manner of life cannot take possession of God's kingdom, so "flesh and blood" by not taking God's kingdom are reduced to the manner of life of the former days. Clearly if the Apostle never put the substance when he meant the works, he would not use it so here either. But if he denied that those who were still in the flesh were in the flesh, denying that they were in the works of the flesh, you ought not to undermine his method, when it is not the substance, but the works of the substance that he is removing from[2] the kingdom of God. When he has set these clearly also before the Galatians he declares that "he prophesies and has prophesied that they who do such things will not inherit the kingdom of God," as they do not of course "carry the likeness of the heavenly, as they had carried that of the *choic*," and are therefore in view of their former manner of life to be considered as nothing else but "flesh and blood." And yet, if the Apostle had suddenly

1 Cor. xv. 50

1 Cor. xv. 49 cf. Eph. iv. 22

cf. Gal. v. 21

cf. 1 Cor. xv. 49

1 Cor. xv. 50

[1] For this type of expression where the genitive is equivalent to an adjective, cf. Hoppe, p. 19.

[2] Really "making as stranger to."

broken out into this statement, that "flesh and blood" must be excluded from "the kingdom of God," without the preparation of any previous thought, should we not have in like manner interpreted these two substances as "the old man" given up to flesh and blood, that is to eating and drinking, whose way it is to say in opposition to belief in the resurrection: "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we shall die"? For by bringing in this also, the Apostle attacked flesh and blood because of their results, eating and drinking.

1 Cor. xv. 50

cf. Eph. iv. 22

1 Cor. xv. 32

50. But setting aside such interpretations as censure the works of flesh and blood, it will be permissible to claim for resurrection even the substances themselves, understood as they really are. For resurrection is not explicitly refused to "flesh and blood," but "the kingdom of God" which falls to the lot of resurrection—there is also of course a resurrection for judgment—nay rather is a general resurrection of the flesh confirmed, when a special is excepted. For since proclamation is made of the condition into which it does not rise again, that into which it does rise again is understood. And thus since the work, and not the nature of the substance experiences a difference in resurrection according to its deserts, it becomes clear in this way too that "flesh and blood" are excluded from God's kingdom because of[1] error, not because of their substance, and yet because of[1] their character they rise again to judg-

cf. 1 Cor. xv. 50

1 Cor. xv. 50

[1] For *nomine* = *causā*, cf. Hoppe, p. 30.

ment, because they do not rise again to the kingdom. I will say further: "Flesh and blood cannot possess the kingdom of God for an inheritance." † deservedly alone and by themselves, in order to show that the Spirit is still necessary to it. For it is the "Spirit" that "makes alive" to the kingdom of God; "the flesh is no use." Yet something else can be of use, namely the Spirit, and through the Spirit the works also of the Spirit. Therefore all flesh and blood alike[1] rise again in their own nature, but those to whom it belongs to approach the kingdom of God will, before they can attain it, have "to put on" the power of "incorruption" and "immortality," without which they cannot approach God's kingdom. Naturally, therefore, "flesh and blood," as we have said, are by themselves incapable of[2] attaining "the kingdom of God." But thereafter, when "this corruptible," that is, flesh, shall "be swallowed up by incorruption," "and this mortal," that is, blood, "by immortality," after resurrection as the result of a change, "flesh and blood" after being changed and swallowed up[3] can rightly "inherit the kingdom of God," not, however, without being raised again. There are some who wish "flesh and blood" to be taken in the sense of Judaism by reason of circumcision, Judaism being itself also alien to the kingdom of God, because it

cf. 1 Cor. xv. 50.

cf. John vi. 63

cf. 1 Cor. xv. 53, 54

1 Cor. xv. 50

cf. 1 Cor. xv. 53, 54

cf. 1 Cor. xv. 50

[1] For *ex aequo*, cf. Hoppe, pp. 101 f.
[2] For the poetical *deficere* = *non posse*, cf. Hoppe, p. 46.
[3] For the alliteration *demutata ac devorata*, cf. Hoppe, p. 150.

too is classed with the former state of things and for this reason is already elsewhere also stigmatized by the Apostle, who "after the Son of God was revealed in his case, that he should preach the good news of Him among the heathen, straightway held no converse with flesh and blood," that is with the circumcision, that is with Judaism, even as he writes to the Galatians.[1]

cf. Gal. i. 16

51. But before all will now stand what we have reserved for the end, even before the Apostle himself, who would truly deserve to be convicted[2] of great thoughtlessness, if so inconsiderately, as certain people argue, with eyes shut, as the proverb says, without making a distinction, without qualification, he thrust out all "flesh and blood" indiscriminately "from the kingdom of God," which means of course also from the very palace of heaven, since "Jesus" still "sits there at the right hand of the Father," a man although God, "the last Adam" although the primal Word, "flesh and blood," although purer than ours, yet the same both in the substance and the form with which He ascended, "in the same form also to descend," as the angels declare, assuredly "to be recognised[3] by those that wounded Him." He, called "a mediator between God and men"[4] by reason of the deposit entrusted to Him by each of the two

cf. Acts vii. 56. Mark xvi. 19
cf. 1 Cor. xv. 45
cf. Acts i. 11
cf. Zech. xii. 10. John xix. 37
1 Tim. ii.

[1] For the ending, cf. c. 1, and Hoppe, p. 156.
[2] For *reuincere* = *conuincere*, cf. Hoppe, p. 25.
[3] For the gerundive with the force of a fut. particip. pass., cf. Hoppe, p. 54.
[4] Cf. d'Alès, p. 199.

parties, keeps the deposit of flesh also in Himself, "the earnest" of the whole sum. For even as He left us "the earnest[1] of the Spirit," so also He received from us the earnest of the flesh and conveyed it to heaven as a pledge that the whole sum would one day be brought back there. Be ye easy in mind, flesh and blood, ye have seized both heaven and the kingdom of God in Christ. Or, if they deny that you are in Christ, let those who have denied heaven to you deny also that Christ is in heaven. Thus he says: "Neither shall corruption have incorruption for an inheritance," not that you should think flesh and blood to be corruption, since they are rather liable to corruption, through death of course, since it is death that not only destroys flesh and blood but also swallows them up, but since he had proclaimed that the works of "flesh and blood cannot attain the kingdom of God," in order that he might the more amplify that, he took away even from corruption itself, that is death, which is brought about by the works of "flesh and blood," the inheritance of incorruption. For a little afterwards also he outlined what one might almost call the death of death, saying: "Death is swallowed up in strife. Where, death, is thy sting? Where, death, is thy power? The sting of death is sin," this will be corruption, "and the power of sin is the law," that other no doubt

cf. 2 Cor. v. 5
cf. 2 Cor. v. 5
1 Cor. xv. 50
cf. 1 Cor. xv. 50
1 Cor. xv. 55, 56

[1] For the defining or constituent genitive *spiritus*, cf. Hoppe, p. 18; but it is probably better to read *spiritum* with the Clairvaux MS.

cf. Rom. vii. 23 which he located "in his members, warring against the law of his spirit," the very power of course of sinning against the will. Even if he says above

cf. 1 Cor. xv. 26 that "death is the last enemy to be brought to naught," in this way "corruption shall[1] not attain

1 Cor. xv. 50 the inheritance of incorruption," that is, not even death will persist. When and how will it end?

1 Cor. xv. 52 When "in a second, in a momentary movement of the eye, at the last bugle both the dead shall rise again undestroyed," who are they but those that were destroyed before, that is bodies, that is flesh and blood?—"and we shall be changed";—from what condition except that in which we shall

1 Cor. xv. 53 be found?—"for this corruptible must put on incorruption and this mortal must put on immortality."

cf. 1 Cor. xv. 53 What is "mortal" but flesh? What is "corruptible" but blood? And lest you should imagine that the Apostle is of another opinion, * * having regard to your interests and struggling that you should understand it to have been said about

cf. 1 Cor. xv. 53 the flesh: when he says "this corruptible" and "this mortal," he is holding the skin itself as he says it. Assuredly he could not have declared "this" except about something at hand, something in evidence. The meaning of the word has reference to the body. The corruptible, moreover, will be one thing, corruption another, and the mortal will be one thing, mortality another. For what is acted upon is one thing, what causes it to be acted upon is another. Thus those things

[1] See the Appendix (under p. 106, l. 8) for the true reading.

which experience corruption and mortality, namely flesh and blood, must of necessity experience both incorruption and immortality.

52. Let us see now at last "with what body" he contends the dead "will come." It is a good thing that he hastened at once to show[1] it, as if some one were putting a question of the kind. "Fool," he says, "what you sow is not brought to life unless it has died." Let this therefore now be established from the example of the seed, that no other flesh is "brought to life" than the very flesh which has died, and thus what follows will shine as day. For it will not be allowable for anything to be understood contrary to the rule of the example, lest because he goes on to say: "And what you sow, is not the body that will be," for that reason you should suppose that another body will rise again than that which by dying is sown. But you have missed the force of the example. For never when wheat has been sown and broken up in the soil has barley burst forth, and not the very same kind of grain and the same nature and character and appearance. For whence could anything else but the thing itself come? Even corruption is the thing itself, since it belongs to the thing itself. For does he not[2] also suggest how it is "not the body that shall be" that is sown, when he says: "But the simple grain, it may be, of wheat or

cf. 1 Cor. xv. 35
1 Cor. xv. 36
cf. 1 Cor. xv. 36
1 Cor. xv. 37
1 Cor. xv. 37
1 Cor. xv. 37, 38

[1] For this "final" infinitive, cf. Hoppe, p. 43.

[2] MSS. *non enim;* I suggest *nonne enim* as nearer to the MSS., and expressing the same meaning as Kroymann's *sed enim*, which is quite Tertullianean, but farther away from the MSS.

something of that kind: God gives it body even as He will." Of course to that grain which he says is sown in a simple state. "Of course," you say. Therefore that is saved to which God is to give a body. But how is it saved, if it is nowhere, if it does not rise again, if it does not rise again identical? If it does not rise again, it is not saved. If, also, it is not safe, it cannot get a body from God. But it is certainly saved in every respect. For what purpose therefore will God give it a body, as He will, since it has of course that body of its own in the simple state, except that it should rise again now no longer bare? Therefore what is built over the body will be additional,[1] nor is that over which it is built destroyed, but it is increased. Moreover, what is increased is saved. For what is sown is only a grain without the garment of a husk, without the basis of an ear, without the protection of a beard, without the glory[2] of a stalk. But it rises up enriched with abundance, built into a structure, set up in order, fortified by cultivation and everywhere clothed.[3] These are for it another body from God, into which it is changed not by destruction but by increase, so that then that also belongs to it, which it gains
1 Cor. xv. 38 from God outside: "And to each of the seeds its own body"; in reality not its own, that is not the former one. Therefore comply with the example

[1] See the Appendix, p. 166.

[2] On this sense of *superbia*, see Hoppe, p. 124.

[3] For the double rime here, *feneratum, aedificatum* on the one hand, and *munitum, uestitum* on the other, cf. Hoppe, p. 165.

and preserve its mirror for the flesh: you will believe that the same as was sown will come to fruitage, the very flesh though fuller, not different, although returning in a different way. For it also will receive equipment[1] and adornment, such as God wills to draw over it[2] according to its deserts. It was without doubt for this purpose that he gave the direction: "Not all flesh is the same flesh"; not to deny the identity of substance but the equalisation of prerogative, bringing the body into a difference, not of kind, but of honour. To illustrate this he adds also figurative instances of animals and elements: "The flesh of a man," that is, of a slave of God, one who is truly a man, "is one, and the flesh of a beast of burden," that is of a pagan—about whom also the prophet says: "Man has been made like unto beasts of burden which are without reason,"—"is another, the flesh of birds" that is, of martyrs who strive to reach the upper regions, "is one, the flesh of fish," that is, those for whom the water of baptism is sufficient, "is another."[3] So also he brings forward arguments from the heavenly bodies: "The glory of the sun," that is, of Christ, "is one, and the glory of the moon," that is, of the Church, "is another, and that of the stars," that is, of the seed of Abraham, "is another." For "star" also "differs from star in glory, and bodies earthly and heavenly," meaning

1 Cor. xv. 39

1 Cor. xv. 39

Ps. xlviii. 21

1 Cor. xv. 39

1 Cor. xv. 41

cf. 1 Cor. xv. 40

[1] On *suggestus* = *ornatus*, cf. Hoppe, p. 124.
[2] A metaphor from putting a garment on.
[3] Cf. d'Alès, p. 431, n. 3.

of course the Jew and the Christian. But if not figuratively, then very foolishly was this comparison made by him between the flesh of mules and of kites[1] on the one hand and the bodies[2] of the heavenly luminaries on the other with human flesh and bodies, as they have no connexion either in regard to their nature or in regard to the attainment[3] of resurrection either. Finally, when through the analogy of these he had concluded there is a difference in glory, though not in sub-

1 Cor. xv. 42 stance, he says: "So also is the resurrection of the dead." How? Differing not in some other respect, but only in glory. For recalling resurrection to the same substance and looking again to the seed,

1 Cor. xv. 42–44 he says: "It is sown in corruption, it rises again in incorruption; it is sown in disgrace, it rises again in glory; it is sown in weakness, it rises again in power; it is sown a physical body, it rises again a spiritual body." Assuredly it is nothing different that rises again from what was sown, and nothing else is sown than what is broken up in the ground, and nothing else is broken up in the ground but flesh. For it was it that the sentence of God dashed

Gen. iii. 19 to the ground: "Earth thou art and into earth thou shalt pass," because it had been taken also from the earth. It was from this fact also that the Apostle got the notion of saying that it "is sown," when it is put back into the earth, because the

[1] For the alliteration *mulorum et miluorum*, cf. Hoppe, p. 151.
[2] Hoppe (p. 149) is hardly justified in citing *carnes et corpora* here as an example of alliteration: cf. his p. 151.
[3] On this sense of *consecutio*, cf. Hoppe, p. 120.

earth is also a storehouse for seeds, which must there be deposited and thence recovered. Therefore also he confirms it as it were by a stamp: "For so is it written," lest you should think that anything else is sown than: "Thou shall go into the earth from which thou wert taken"; so it has to do with nothing but the flesh: for so is it written.[1]

1 Cor. xv. 44
Gen iii. 19

53. But certain people argue that by "physical body"[2] is meant the soul, in order to rob the flesh of that renewal. But since it is certain and sure that the body which was sown will rise again, they will be challenged to produce the thing itself. Or else let them show that the soul was sown after death, that is, dead, that is, dashed on the ground, scattered, broken up, a fate not decreed for it by God; let them set forth its "corruption" and "disgrace" and "weakness," that it may belong to it also to rise to "incorruption" and to "glory" and to "power." But in the case of Lazarus, the signal example of resurrection, the flesh lay in "weakness," the flesh almost putrefied in "dishonour," the flesh meantime "stank" in decay, and yet Lazarus rose again flesh, with a soul indeed, but undecayed, which no one had "bound with cotton bands," no one had "placed in a tomb," no one had felt was "already stinking," no one had seen sown "for four days." The whole appearance, the whole

1 Cor. xv. 44
cf. 1 Cor. xv. 42, 43
cf. John xi. 1 18
cf. 1 Cor. xv. 43
cf. John xi. 39, 44
cf. John xi. 44
cf. John xi. 17, 39
cf. John xi. 17, 39

[1] It is doubtful how this ending is to be taken, if it be genuine (Hoppe, p. 156).
[2] Cf. d'Alès, p. 62.

fate of Lazarus is experienced by the flesh also of all to-day, but by the soul of no one. Therefore that with which the Apostle's writing clearly deals, that concerning which it is known he is speaking,
cf. 1 Cor. xv. 44 will be both "a physical body," when it is sown, and "a spiritual body" when it is raised. For that you may understand it so, he further lends a hand, by repeating, likewise on the authority of the same
cf. 1 Cor. xv. 45 Scripture, that "the first man Adam was made into a living soul."[1] If Adam was "the first man," and if man was flesh before he was soul,[2] without doubt flesh will have been made into soul. Further, having been made into soul, since it was body, it
cf. 1 Cor. xv. 44 became of course "a physical[3] body." What would they like it to be called other than it became through the soul, other than it was not before the soul joined it, other than it will not be after the soul leaves it, except when it rises again? For on
cf. 1 Cor. xv. 44 recovering the soul it becomes again "a physical
cf. 1 Cor. xv. 44 body," that it may become "spiritual." For only that which has been, rises *again*. Thus what con-
cf. 1 Cor. xv. 44 stitutes the fitness of the flesh to be called "a physical body," is in no way applicable to the soul.[4]
cf. 1 Cor. xv. 44 For the flesh was a body before it was a "physical body": when furnished with a soul it then became a

[1] For *retexere* with acc. and inf., cf. Hoppe, p. 52, and for the meaning of the word, Hoppe, p. 192.

[2] Or "before he received a soul": such a pregnant use of *ante* is Tertullianean, cf. *Apol.* 12 (p. 44, l. 1, ed. Mayor, with note).

[3] Here and elsewhere it seems impossible to preserve the assonance and etymological figure between *anima* and *animalis*.

[4] For the construction of *competere* with accus. and infin., cf. c. 47, and Hoppe, p. 48.

"physical body." But the soul, though it is a body, yet, because it is a body that is not endowed with soul but is rather soul-giving, cannot be called a "physical body," nor can it become what it makes.[1] For when it happens to another it makes it physical: but if it does not happen to another, how will it make itself physical? Therefore, even as flesh is first a "physical body," when it receives soul, so also afterwards it is a "spiritual body," when it puts on spirit. The Apostle arranging this order in Adam also and in Christ, rightly marks him off as in the principal parts of the distinction itself (saying: "The first man Adam was made into a living soul, the last Adam into a life-giving spirit.") But when he calls Christ "the last Adam," from this you must recognise that he worked with all the strength of his teaching for the resurrection of the flesh, not of the soul. For if even "the first man Adam" was flesh, not soul, who in the end "was made into a living soul," and "the last Adam," Christ, was therefore "Adam" because a man, therefore a man because flesh, not because soul. So if he adds: "What is spiritual does not come first, but what is physical, and then what is spiritual," according to both Adams, does it seem at all possible to you to distinguish a "physical body" and a "spiritual body" in the same flesh, a distinction in which he prepared in both Adams, that is, in both men? For in what substance[2] are Christ and Adam

cf. 1 Cor. xv. 44

cf. 1 Cor. xv. 44

cf. 1 Cor. xv. 44

cf. 1 Cor. xv. 45

1 Cor. xv. 45

1 Cor. xv. 45

1 Cor. xv. 45

1 Cor. xv. 46

1 Cor xv. 44

[1] Cf. d'Alès, p. 114.

[2] For *ex* with abl. = abl. of respect, cf. Hoppe, p. 33.

equal[1] to one another? In the flesh of course. Though it be also in the soul, yet it is because of the flesh that they are both man; for man was first flesh. From it they were able to admit of order also, so that one should be regarded as "the first," the other as "the last" man, that is "Adam."[2] But things that differ cannot be arranged in order, at least as regards substance: for as regards place or time or circumstances perhaps they may. Here, however, it is from the substance flesh that they are called "first" and "last," just as again also "the first man from the earth" "and the second from heaven"; because although He is from heaven according to the spirit, he is yet man according to the flesh. Therefore since the order in both Adams suits the flesh, not the soul, [they were distinguished as "the first man into a living soul, the last into a life-giving spirit,"] a distinction between them will equally injure the flesh,[3] so that the following words will have been said about the flesh: "Not that which is spiritual is first, but what is physical, then what is spiritual," and thus it may be the same as is to be understood above, both that which is sown, a "physical body," and that which rises again, a "spiritual body," because "that which is spiritual is not first, but that which is physical," because "the first Adam became a

cf. 1 Cor. xv. 44

1 Cor. xv. 47

1 Cor. xv. 45

1 Cor. xv. 46

1 Cor. xv. 44

1 Cor. xv. 46

1 Cor. xv. 45

[1] For the word *pariare*, see Hoppe, pp. 135 f.

[2] This clause refers merely to the word "man."

[3] I have removed *distinctionem*, and thus restored the constr. in c. 48; for *praeiudicare* c. dat. see also L–S, and add *Study of Ambst.*, p. 126, Aug. Pelag.

soul, the last Adam became a spirit." All from man, all from flesh, since from man. What then shall we say? Has not the flesh even now "the spirit by faith"? This leads to the question how "a physical body" is said to be "sown." Clearly here too the flesh receives "spirit," but "as an earnest," of the soul however not an earnest, but the full amount.[1] So also for that reason, because of the greater substance, it was called a "physical body" in which form it "is sown," and will become in like manner through the fullness of the spirit "spiritual" as well, in which character it is raised again. What wonder if it gets its name rather from that with which it is packed, than from that with which it is sprinkled?[2]

cf. Gal. v. 5

1 Cor. xv. 44 cf. 2 Cor. i. 22, v. 5

cf. 1 Cor. xv. 44

54. Thus it is that questionings are very often furnished from the chance occurrences of words[3] as they are also from their common use. For because the following also occurs in the Apostle: "that the mortal," meaning the flesh, "may be swallowed up by life," they lay hold also of "swallowing" and claim that it means the ruin, of the flesh of course, as if we are not said to "swallow" anger and pain, meaning to put it away

2 Cor. v. 4

[1] Cf. d'Alès, pp. 117 f.

[2] For this doubtful ending, cf. Hoppe, p. 56, and the end of 52.

[3] Hoppe (p. 86) explains that *uocabulorum* has the force of an adj., and that *occasionibus* is made plural under the influence of the plural *uocabulorum*. He quotes Kellner's translation of the phrase, "chosen expressions." See also Hoppe, p. 120, n., where he translates the phrase by "accidentally chosen words," and the following phrase *uerborum communionibus* by "common, *i.e.* metaphorical or metonymical use of words."

and cover and restrain it within ourselves. Further since this too has been written: "This mortal must put on immortality," it is shown how "the mortal is swallowed up by life," while that which is clothed with immortality is put away and covered and kept within, not consumed and lost.[1] "Therefore death, too," you say, "will be saved when it has been swallowed up."[2] [3]*Distinguish related words according to their meanings, and you will understand correctly. "Death" is one thing, and "mortal" is another. Death, therefore, will be swallowed up in one way, and mortal in another. Death does not take immortality, but mortal does. For it is written that[4] "this mortal must put on immortality." How therefore does it take it? By being "swallowed up by life." How is it "swallowed up by life"? By being received and annexed[5] and shut up within it. But death is rightly swallowed up in ruin, because it also swallows up for this purpose. "Death," says the Scripture, "became strong and swallowed up," and therefore "it was swallowed up in strife.[6] Where, death, is thy sting? Where, death, is thy strife?" In like manner life also, which is of course death's enemy,[7] will by strife swallow up into

1 Cor. xv. 53 cf. 2 Cor. v. 4

cf. 1 Cor. xv. 53

cf. 2 Cor. v. 4

Isa. xxv. 8

1 Cor. xv. 55

[1] On the alliteration *absumitur, amittitur*, cf. Hoppe, p. 149.
[2] For the periphrastic conjugation, see Hoppe, p. 60.
[3] MSS. *ideo*. The problem seems to be this: what word in Visigothic script has been corrupted to *ideo?*
[4] For this *quod*, cf. c. 4 and Hoppe, p. 75.
[5] On the alliteration in *reciptur, redigitur*, cf. Hoppe, p. 153.
[6] See above, ch. 47, p. 117.
[7] On this sense of *aemulus*, etc., in Tert., cf. Hoppe, p. 125.

salvation what through strife death[1] swallowed up into destruction.[2]

55. Although, for that reason, in proving that the flesh will rise again, we by this very fact prove that it will in no way be a different flesh from that with which we are dealing, yet individual questions and their motives demand also special contests, although they have already been defeated[3] from a different side. We shall therefore explain more fully both the power and the method of the change, which almost supplies the notion that it is another flesh that will rise again, as if to change meant to cease entirely[4] and to perish out of the original substance. Change, however, must be distinguished from every theory of destruction : for change is one thing, destruction another. But[5] there will be no difference at all if the flesh is so changed as to be destroyed. And it will be destroyed when changed, if it does not itself persist amidst the change that has been shown[6] in resurrection. For even as it is destroyed if it does not rise again, so also if it does indeed rise again, but is withdrawn in the change, it is equally destroyed. For it will just as much cease to exist as if[7] it had not risen again. And

[1] I think Clairv. MS. and Gelenius are right in omitting *tuam*.

[2] On this ending, cf. c. 19 and Hoppe, p. 156.

[3] The metaphor in *congressus* and *caesae* is from battle (*caesae* = *profligatae*, Hoppe, p. 182). The underlying idea is something like that under our "flogging of a dead horse."

[4] For *in totum* = *omnino*, cf. Hoppe, p. 101, and another passage below in this chapter.

[5] *Porro* in the sense "but," see Hoppe, p. 113.

[6] For the periphrastic conjugation, cf. cc. 22, 27, 54, and Hoppe, p. 60.

[7] For *ac si* = *quasi*, cf. Hoppe, p. 84.

how absurd, if it rises again only to cease to exist, since it could have refrained from rising again,[1] and been non-existent all the same, because already it had begun not to exist. Things that differ entirely, change and destruction, must not be combined,[2] being of course different in functions. The latter destroys, the former merely changes. Even as, therefore, what is destroyed has not been changed, so what is changed has not been destroyed. For to have been destroyed means, for that which has been, to cease entirely[3] to be; to be changed is to be different.[4] But while a thing is different, it can be the identical thing. For it possesses the being that is indestructible; for it is change it has experienced, not destruction. And to such a degree is it possible for something both to be changed and nevertheless to be itself, that even the whole man in this life is in being indeed the man himself, and yet changes in many ways, both in appearance and bodily quality itself and health and circumstances and honour and age, in pursuit, business, trade, wealth, homes, laws, habits, and yet he does not lose any part of manhood, nor does he become different in such a way as to cease to be the same. Nay rather, he is not made a different person either, but only a different thing. That this is the character of the change is proved also by divine teaching. Moses' hand is changed

cf. Exod. iv. 6, 7

[1] For the perfect infin. after *potuit*, see Hoppe, p. 53.
[2] For the future of command or obligation, cf. Hoppe, p. 65.
[3] For *in totum* = *omnino*, cf. Hoppe, p. 101.
[4] Cf. d'Alès, p. 363.

and is indeed bloodless like a dead hand, very white[1] and cold, but when it has both recovered heat and its "colour"[2] has rushed back to it, it is the same flesh and blood. Later the same man's face also was changed to a brightness on which no one could gaze, but he who could not be looked upon was none the less Moses. So also Stephen had already assumed "angelic" glory, but it was no other "knees" that had fallen before[3] the stoning. The Lord too on retiring to "the mountain" had changed even "his garments" to brightness, but He had kept features that "Peter" could recognise; where also "Moses and Elijah," the one in a copy of the flesh he had not yet recovered, the other in the reality of flesh that had not yet died, taught that, nevertheless, the same appearance of body continues even in a state of glory. Paul, too, taught by this example, says: "Who shall transform the body of our humility to take the same form as the body of His glory." But if you contend that both transformation and change mean the passing away of each substance, was Saul too therefore changed into another man when he left his own body? And does Satan himself, when "he is transformed into an angel of light,"[4] lose his own character? I think not. So also at the occurrence of resurrection it will be possible to be

cf. Exod. xxxiv. 29-35

cf. Acts vi. 15

cf. Acts vii. 60, 59

cf. Matt. xvii. 3-8

Phil. iii. 21

cf. 2 Cor. xii. 2

cf. 2 Cor. xi. 14

[1] For the alliteration in *exsanguis, exalbida*, cf. Hoppe, p. 150.
[2] For the alliteration and rime combined, *calore, colore*, cf. Hoppe, p. 167.
[3] On *succidere*, see Hoppe, p. 30.
[4] Cf. d'Alès, p. 157, n. 5.

changed, altered, given a new shape, while the substance remains safe.[1]

56. And indeed how absurd, and really how unjust, and in both cases how unworthy of God, that one substance should work while another should receive the final reward,[2] so that this flesh should be torn by martyrdoms, while another is crowned, and also, contrariwise,[3] this flesh should wallow in filth,[4] while another is condemned. Is it not better to withdraw all faith once for all[5] from the hope of resurrection,[6] than to make sport of the majesty and righteousness of God?[7] That Marcion should be raised again in place of Valentinus! Since it is incredible that the mind or memory or conscience of a man of to-day should be wiped out by means of that changing garment of immortality and incorruption, which would mean of course the abolition of the gain and profit of resurrection as well as the position of divine judgment in either sphere.[8] If I do not remember that I am the man who earned the judgment, how shall I give God glory? How "shall I sing a new song to Him," if I do not know that I am he who is indebted for indulgence? Why, besides, is the change of flesh alone excepted, not that of

cf. Ps. cxliii. 9, etc.

[1] For this ending, cf. c. 2 and Hoppe, p. 157.
[2] Cf. *Exh. Cast.* 2 am. *æternitatis mercede dispungit*, and see the index to Mayor's Tert., *Apol.*, and Hoppe, p. 130.
[3] For *e contrario*, cf. Hoppe, p. 102.
[4] For the plural of the abstract noun, cf. Hoppe, p. 91.
[5] For *semel* in this sense, cf. c. 13 and Hoppe, p. 113.
[6] This was what Marcion did.
[7] As Valentinus did.
[8] Upon the body and the soul.

the soul as well, which in all things has had command over the flesh? How absurd to suppose[1] that the same soul as has gone through the whole course of life in this flesh, as has learned of God in this flesh and has "put on Christ" and has sown the hope of salvation, should reap the fruit in some other flesh! Truly that flesh will be very grateful whose life costs it nothing.[2] But if the soul also is not changed, then there is no resurrection of the soul either; for no one will believe that it itself either has risen again, if it does not rise again other than what it was.

cf. Gal. iii. 27, etc.

57. Hence now comes the well-known quibbling of vulgar unbelief; "if," they say, "the selfsame substance is brought back with its own shape, outline, character, therefore it must be in company also with its remaining characteristics. Therefore the blind, the lame, the paralytic and all others marked by some special characteristic at death, will return also with that characteristic." What matters it, supposing you thus disdain to attain so great a favour, whatever[3] it may be, from God? For do you not even now by admitting the salvation of the soul alone, assign the same gifts to half men? What is belief in a resurrection, if it be not belief in a complete

[1] For *quale est*, cf. Hoppe, p. 82.

[2] For the parechesis or assonance, *gratiosissima, gratis*, cf. Hoppe, p. 172.

[3] This *qualiscumque* may refer to the subject of *dedignaris*: "whoever you may be." The commentators seem to have felt no difficulty about it.

resurrection? For if flesh will be restored from a state of decomposition, much more will it be brought back from a state of torture.[1] The greater lays down the law for the less. Is not the amputation or crushing[2] of any limb the death of that limb? If the death of the whole is annulled by resurrection, what of the death of a part? If we are changed into glory, how much more into soundness?[3] Damage to bodies is an accidental character, soundness is their rightful character.[4] In it we are born: even if we be damaged in the womb, the experience is that of one who is already a human-being; nature[5] is earlier than accident. As life is brought to us by God, so also is it brought back. We who get it back are the same people as get it[6] at the beginning. It is to nature, not to injury that we are restored: we recover again our original life, not our injured life. If God does not raise us whole, he does not raise the dead. For what dead man is whole, even if he dies whole? What dead man is entire? What body is unharmed, when it has been killed, when

[1] This means the injury which produces blindness, lameness, etc.

[2] Perhaps this is wrong. As the Latin translators of the Bible used *obtundere*, *obtu(n)sio* to render πωροῦν, πώρωσις (see Dean Robinson's *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians*, pp. 267 ff.), it is quite possible that we ought to render "blinding" here: cf. *caeci* above. Hoppe (p. 135, n.) renders "das Zerstossen" (= bruising).

[3] He means completeness of every limb and part, however mutilated in life.

[4] The contrast is that familiar to logic between the *accidens* and the *proprium*.

[5] "Kind" or "class." One has to be a human being first before one can be hurt.

[6] For the double rime, *confertur*, *refertur*, and *accipimus*, *recipimus*, cf. Hoppe, p. 165.

it is cold, when it is ghastly pale, when it is very stiff, when it is a corpse? When is a man more maimed than when he is maimed in every part? When is he more paralysed, than when he is immovable? So for a dead man resurrection is nothing but the becoming whole, lest he should still[1] be dead in that part in which he has not risen again. God is competent to restore what He made: this sign both of His power and of His generosity He already sufficiently promised, or rather fulfilled in Christ, who is not only the resuscitator, but also the renewer[2] of the flesh. And besides the Apostle also says: "And the dead shall rise again uncorrupted." How can this be, except as whole, though previously they had wasted away alike through the fault of ill-health and the long time[3] of burial? For in making both statements earlier also, that "this corruptible must put on incorruption and this mortal must put on immortality," he did not repeat the thought, but commended the difference to their attention. For by separating the two, and making "immortality" refer to the annulment of death, and "incorruption" to the blotting out of corruption, he adapted the one to resurrection, the other to renewal. I fancy he promised to the Thessalonians also the renewal

1 Cor. xv. 52

cf. 1 Cor. xv. 53

cf. 1 Cor. xv. 53

cf. 1 Thess. iv. 13–18

[1] For *adhuc* with *ne*, cf. Hoppe, p. 110.

[2] On the word *redintegrator*, cf. Hoppe, pp. 95, 116, and on the alliteration with rime in *resuscitatorem, redintegratorem*, cf. Hoppe, p. 167.

[3] *Lit.*, "the old age of burial"; it does not seem possible to preserve this striking phrase in English. For the double alliteration, *uitio ualitudinis, senio sepulturae*, cf. Hoppe, p. 148.

of their whole being. Therefore for the future bodily blemishes will not be dreaded. Entirety, whether preserved or restored, can lose nothing, since[1] to it is restored even what it had lost. In laying down the rule that the flesh will still encounter the same sufferings, if it be said that it is the same flesh which will rise again, you are rashly taking up nature's defence against its Lord, you are impiously seeking to vindicate "law" against "grace," as if it were not permissible for the Lord both to change and to preserve nature apart from law. For to what purpose do we read: "What is impossible with men, is possible with God" and: "God chose the foolish things of the world to bring to naught the wise things of the world"? I pray you, if you liberate a slave of yours,[2] will his flesh and soul, because they will remain the same, have for that reason to suffer the same lashes and fetters and brandings to which they were previously subjected? I think not. And yet he is honoured with the brightness of the white robe, the distinction of the gold ring, the name, the tribe and a place at the table of his former master. Grant to God too this authority to restore, through the power of that change, circumstances, not nature, since sufferings are taken away and supports are granted. So the flesh will indeed remain, liable to suffering even after resurrection in virtue of the fact that it is itself and

cf. Rom. vi. 14, etc.

Matt. xix. 26

1 Cor. i. 27

[1] It seems just possible that *ex quo* is temporal.

[2] This passage is a most important testimony to the ancient procedure on manumission at this time.

the same, yet incapable of suffering in virtue of the fact that it was liberated by the Lord for this very purpose that it should not suffer any more.[1]

58. "Everlasting happiness," says Isaiah, "upon their head." There is nothing everlasting except after resurrection. "Fled away from them," he says, "are pain and mourning and groaning." In like manner also says the angel to John: "And God will wipe away every tear from their eyes"; of course from the same eyes as had wept before and could have been still weeping, if the divine favour did not dry up every shower of tears. And again: "For God will wipe away every tear from their eyes, and death will be no more"[2]; therefore also "corruption" will be no more,[2] put to flight through "incorruption" in the same way exactly as "death" through "immortality." If "pain and mourning and groaning" and "death" itself come to us from wounds to soul and to flesh, how will they be removed, unless the causes cease, I mean the causes of injury to flesh and soul? What place have calamities with the Lord? Or what place have hostile raids with Christ? What place have attacks of evil spirits with the Holy Spirit, when even "the devil" himself has with his messengers "been sunk in fire"? Where is the inevitable or what is called fortune or fate?[3]

Isa. xxxv. 10

Rev. vii. 17

Rev. xxi. 4

Rev. xxi. 4

cf. Rev. xx. 10

[1] For this ending, cf. c. 1, and Hoppe, p. 156.

[2] On this sense of *hactenus*, cf. c. 6, and Hoppe, p. 111.

[3] This is aimed at Stoic determinism, illustrated for example by Lucan's poem, *De Bello Civili*, where *fortuna* and *fatum* are synonyms.

What blow can come upon the raised after this indulgence has been granted them? What wrath can come upon the reconciled after they have received God's favour? What feebleness can be theirs when they have received power? What weakness after they have received[1] health?[2] "The clothing" and "footgear" of the children of Israel remained for those "forty years" neither worn out nor decayed; in their very bodies too a right feeling for fitness and respectability checked the easy growth of nails and hair, lest even their excessive growth might be regarded as a corruption; the Babylonian fires harmed neither "the turbans" nor "the trowsers" of the three brothers,[3] though that dress was foreign to the Jews; Jonah, though swallowed by a sea-monster in whose belly wrecked ships were digesting, was three days later belched forth unharmed: even to-day Enoch and Elijah, their cases not yet settled by resurrection,[4] because they never died,[5] yet inasmuch as they have been removed from the world and are already by this very fact candidates for everlasting life, are thoroughly learning the emancipation of the flesh from every defect and

cf. Deut. viii. 4, xxix. 5(4)

cf. Dan. iii. 21

cf. Jon. ii. 1

cf. Gen. v. 24

cf. 4 Kingdoms, ii. 11

[1] Note the four examples of the pregnant use of *post*; cf. c. 5, and Hoppe, p. 141, who supples *acceptam* in thought.

[2] No one word will express the full content of *salus*: "Salvation" is of course included here, but it does not preserve the metaphor of the original.

[3] This topic interested Tertullian; cf. *De Orat.*, 15 ex.

[4] On this phrase, cf. Hoppe, p. 130, who paraphrases *nondum resurrectione dispuncti*: "who have yet to take part in resurrection."

[5] On the rime *dispuncti, functi*, cf. Hoppe, p. 165.

from every loss and from every harm and insult. What belief do these facts support by their sealed evidence? Must we not believe that they are proofs of future entirety?[1] For they were "figures for our benefit," as the Apostle teaches us, written that we should believe the Lord to be at once more powerful than any law about bodies, and even more the preserver of the flesh, whose "clothing" even and whose "footgear" He protected.[2]

cf. 1 Cor. ix. 10

cf. Deut. viii. 8, xxix. 5

59. "But," you say, "the future age belongs to another arrangement which is eternal: therefore a substance belonging to this age, not being eternal, cannot possess properties different from its own." Certainly not, if man exists for the sake of the arrangement that is to be, and not that arrangement for man's sake. But in truth when the Apostle writes: "Whether the world or life or death or the future or the present, all things are yours," he makes them heirs also of the future. It is no bounty that Isaiah confers on you when he says: "All flesh is grass": and yet[3] he says elsewhere: "And all flesh shall see God's salvation." It was the results, not the substances that he distinguished. For who does not place the judgment of God in the two sentences, salvation and punishment? "All flesh," therefore, that is

1 Cor. iii. 22

Isa. xl. 6

Isa. xl. 5

Isa. xl. 6

[1] Of the fact that we are raised complete, without any mutilation.

[2] For this ending, cf. c. 1, and Hoppe, p. 156.

[3] There is no need to add *quia* with Kroymann; on *et* = "and yet," see Mayor on Tert., *Apol.*, c. 2, p. 10, l. 27; c. 37, p. 108, l. 9.

Isa. xl. 5 marked out for fire, "is grass," and "all flesh," that is appointed for salvation, "will see the salvation of God." I know that I neither committed adultery in another flesh, nor am now in another flesh struggling to show continence. If there is any one carrying about two sets of genital organs, he can now take away "the grass" of unclean "flesh" and also keep to himself the only "flesh that will see the salvation of God." But since the same prophet shows that even "nations" are at one time regarded "as dust" and "spittle," at another time as "about to hope" and believe "in the name" and in "the arm of the Lord," can we be deceived even as regards nations? And is it as the result of a difference in substance that some of them "will believe," and others have been deemed "as dust"? But Christ also within the ocean[1] and from this sky which broods over us, shone as the "true light" upon the nations,—even the Valentinians themselves have learned to err in this,—and the believing nations will have no different appearance of flesh or soul from that of the unbelieving. Therefore just as he distinguished the same nations not by their class but by their lot, so also he distinguished the flesh, which even in the nations is one substance, not in material but in reward.[2]

cf. Isa. xl. 6
cf. Isa. xl. 5
cf. Isa. xxix. 5, xl. 15, xlii. 4
cf. Isa. liii. 1
cf. Isa. xxix. 5
cf. Isa. xl. 15
cf. John i. 9

60. And behold, to pile up yet more controversy upon the flesh, particularly the same flesh, they

[1] The Valentinians said that there were other human beings of different nature from us, outside this world, while we were not real human beings at all, but something quite inferior.

[2] For this ending, cf. c. 1, and Hoppe, p. 156.

quibble also about the functions of the various parts of the body, either saying that even they themselves ought to remain in their activities and advantages, as assigned to the same quality of body, or because it is well-known that the functions of the different parts will cease, let them obliterate the bodily quality also,† whose continuance cannot of course be believed without limbs, because limbs too cannot be believed to be without functions. "For to what purpose then," they say, "is this cave of the mouth and position [1] of the teeth and downward course of the gullet [2] and meeting-place in the stomach [3] and depth of the belly [4] and intricate length of the intestines,[5] when there will be no opportunity for eating and drinking? To what purpose do such organs admit, masticate, pass down, break up, digest, discharge? What will be the use of the hands themselves and the feet and all the working parts of the body, when even trouble about food will cease? What will be the use of the kidneys with their knowledge of the seeds [6] they contain, and of the other genital organs [7] of both sexes and the dwelling places [8] of foetus and the streams from the nurse's breasts, when

[1] Is it a metaphor from a line of soldiers?
[2] For the noun *lapsus* with the force of an adj., cf. Hoppe, p. 86.
[3] On this defining or constituent genitive, cf. Hoppe, pp. 18, 173.
[4] On this metaphor, see Hoppe, p. 173.
[5] See the note on *lapsus* above; there is also hypallage here, the phrase being equal to *intestina perplexa et procera* (Hoppe, p. 87).
[6] On the metaphor and personification here, cf. Hoppe, p. 179.
[7] *Genitalium* is a partitive genitive, *reliqua genitalium* being equal to *reliqua genitalia* (Hoppe, p. 20).
[8] Perhaps "stalls," as Hoppe, p. 173, suggests.

sexual intercourse and conception and upbringing[1] alike will cease to be? Finally, what use[2] will the whole body be, which will of course have absolutely nothing to do? To meet these arguments, therefore, we have stated the principle[3] that the arrangements of the future and of the present ought not to be compared, as change will then intervene, and we now add that these functions of the bodily parts exist for the needs of the present life until the time at which life itself also is moved from a temporal to an everlasting condition, just as the "physical body" is changed to a "spiritual," while "this mortal" will "put on immortality and this corruptible put on incorruption": moreover when life itself has then been freed from needs, the parts of the body will also be freed from their functions, but they will not therefore cease to be necessary. For although they are freed from their functions, yet[4] they are kept for judgments, "that each may receive in the body in harmony with his behaviour." "God's tribunal" demands that a man shall be whole: but without the various parts of the body one cannot be whole: it is not of their functions, but of their substance that a man is composed, unless perchance[5] you will maintain that you can

cf. 1 Cor. xv. 44; cf. 1 Cor. xv. 53

2 Cor. v. 10

cf. Rom. xiv. 10

[1] On *educatus* = *educatio*, cf. Hoppe, p. 124, n.

[2] On the anaphora, the five rhetorical questions with *quo*, cf. Hoppe, p. 147.

[3] For *praestruere* c. acc. et inf., a construction not mentioned in lexx., cf. *De Anim.* 18, quoted by Hoppe, p. 52.

[4] For this apodotic *sed*, cf. cc. 14, 35, 40, and Hoppe, p. 108.

[5] *Nisi forte* used, just as in Cicero, etc., *nisi forte* is "very often" used to "introduce a statement which the writer wishes to stamp as absurd" (Reid on Cicero, *Pro Milone*, § 8).

also have a whole ship without keel,[1] without bow, without stern, without soundness of the whole framework.[2] And yet we have often seen a ship that has been shattered by a storm or has crumbled through decay, made the same again when all its parts have been restored and repaired,[3] and even boasting because of its restoration: are we then punished[4] because of the skill and judgment[5] and power of God? Moreover, if a rich and generous owner, offering to his affection or his fame only the restoration of the ship, has done that work on it and no more,[6] will you therefore deny that the former structure was necessary to him, as it would thenceforward be useless, since it would serve simply to complete the ship without giving it the power to work?[7] Therefore it is enough to learn this alone, when the Lord in designing man for salvation designed the flesh for this purpose, whether He wishes it to be again the same. The fact that the parts of the body will be purposeless[8] will not give you the right to lay down the law that the flesh cannot exist again. For a thing may exist anew and yet be without duties, and besides it cannot be said to be without duties if it do not

[1] *Carina* means throughout Latin probably the hull, or at least the lower part of the hull, not simply the keel.
[2] An example of hypallage = *compagine tota et incolumi* (Hoppe, p. 87).
[3] On the alliteration, see Hoppe, p. 153.
[4] On *torquere*, cf. c. 39, and Hoppe, p. 192.
[5] On the alliteration *artificio, arbitrio*, cf. Hoppe, p. 149.
[6] On this force of *hactenus*, cf. cc. 6, 58, and Hoppe, p. 111.
[7] On this illustration, see Hoppe, p. 202.
[8] On *uacatio* = "purposelessness," cf. Hoppe, p. 140.

exist. But yet if it exist, it will be able also not to be without duties: for nothing will be without duties in the presence of God.

61. But, oh man, you received your mouth for swallowing and drinking. Why not rather for speaking, so as to differ from all other animals? Why not rather to preach God, so as to excel[1] human beings also? For "Adam proclaimed the names for animals" before he plucked the fruit from the tree, he also prophesied before he devoured. But you received your teeth to gnaw meat:[2] why not rather to do honour to every gape and grin of yours? Why not rather to control the wags of the tongue, to seal up the utterances of the voice by destruction? Again both hear and see the toothless, that you may seek the ornament, which is the mouth, and the tool, which is the teeth. The lower parts are pierced both in man and in woman, without doubt that lusts[3] may surge there: why not rather that discharges may be strained there? Women have still a place inside where seeds may be collected: is there a place where the accumulations of blood may retire, which the more inactive sex is unable[4] to disperse? For even this must be said, because[5] they scornfully carp at such functions of the parts of the body as they have a

cf. Gen. ii. 20
cf. Gen. iii. 6; ii. 19, 20
cf. Gen. iii. 6

[1] On *antistare*, see c. 35, and Hoppe, p. 27.
[2] *macellum*, "meat market," here by a metonymy means "meat" (Hoppe, p. 94).
[3] Hoppe (p. 93, n. 4) suggests that *libidines* here may have the concrete sense *semina*.
[4] On the poet. use of *sufficere* = "to be able," cf. Hoppe, p. 47.
[5] For *quatenus* = "because," see Hoppe, pp. 82 f.

mind to, in whatever persons and in whatever way they please, purposely, in order to make the idea of resurrection ridiculous,[1] not reflecting that the reasons themselves for need will first be wanting then, namely hunger for food, thirst for drink, birth for copulation, and sustenance for work. For when death has been removed, neither will there be the props of nourishment for the protection of life nor will the restoration of the race be burdensome to the organs. Besides even to-day the intestines and the private parts[2] may have a rest. "For forty days Moses" and "Elijah fasted" and were nourished by God alone. For even then the doctrine was laid down[3]: "Not on[4] bread but on the word of God shall man live." Behold the outlines of the strength that is to be. We too, as far as we can, give our mouths a dispensation from food;[5] we even withdraw our virility from intercourse. How many voluntary "eunuchs" there are! How many virgins there are married to Christ! How many barren persons of both sexes there are equipped[6] with unfruitful genitals? And if it is possible[7] even here and now for both the functions and the gains of the bodily organs to rest from activity for

cf. Exod. xxiv. 18 cf. 3 Kingdoms, xix. 8 Deut. viii. 3 (cf. Matt. iv. 4, etc.)

cf. Matt. xix. 12

[1] On this sense of *suffundere*, cf. Hoppe, p. 139.
[2] For the neuters *intestinis* and *pudendis*, see Hoppe, p. 97.
[3] For *dedicare*, thus used, see Hoppe, p. 128.
[4] On *in*, where the plain instrumental abl. would be sufficient, cf. Hoppe, pp. 32 f.
[5] Or "deny the mouth foods" (cf. Hoppe, p. 35, for this use of *excusare*).
[6] *Structi* = *instructi* (Hoppe, p. 138; Engelbrecht in *Wiener Studien*, Bd. xxviii [1906], pp. 153, f.).
[7] For *est* with the infin., cf. cc. 3, 16 and Hoppe, p. 47.

a time, when the system is but for a time, and nevertheless man is just as whole,[1] in like manner when man is whole, and indeed to a greater degree then, amidst an everlasting system, we shall even more refrain from desiring what already here we have been accustomed to do without.[2]

62. But the Lord's declaration puts an end to this discussion: for He says: "They shall be as angels." If in "not marrying," because also in not dying, then certainly too in not submitting[3] to any similar need arising from the bodily state, because "angels" also were sometimes "as men" in "eating" and drinking and putting forth their "feet" to be "washed"; for they had put on a human appearance, while still retaining their inner nature unimpaired.[4] Therefore, if "angels, becoming like men," assumed the behaviour of those in the flesh, while retaining the same spiritual nature, why may not men also, "becoming like angels," submit to a spiritual system, while retaining the same nature of flesh?[5] They would not be more subject to the practices[6] of the state of flesh in angels' garb than angels then were to the practices[6] of the spiritual state in human garb, nor would they fail to remain in the flesh for the reason that they did not remain in the practices of

cf. Matt. xxii. 30

cf. Gen. xviii. 8

cf. Gen. xviii. 4

cf. Gen. xviii. 2

cf. Matt. xxii. 30

cf. Matt. xxii. 30

[1] Here again (cf. c. 58) the full idea cannot be expressed in one English word.

[2] On this ending, cf. c. 2, and Hoppe, p. 157.

[3] On *succidere*, see c. 55, and Hoppe, p. 30.

[4] Cf. d'Alès, p. 155, n. 9.

[5] Cf. d'Alès, p. 156, n. 5.

[6] For adj. as substantive, cf. Hoppe, p. 97.

the flesh, since the angels too did not fail to remain in the spirit for the reason that they did not also remain in the practices of the spirit. For He did not say: "They will be angels," lest He should be denying their humanity, but "as angels," in order to preserve their humanity. He did not take away the nature of him to whom He added a likeness.[1] Matt. xxii. 30

63. The flesh, therefore, will rise again, and indeed whole, and indeed itself, and indeed unimpaired. It is everywhere in security[2] with God through the faithful "mediator between God and men, Jesus Christ," who will restore both God to man and man to God, flesh to spirit and spirit to flesh.[3] He has already united both in Himself, He has coupled the bride with the bridegroom and the bridegroom with the bride. And if any one maintains that the soul is the bride, the flesh will go with the soul, if only as a dowry. The soul will not be a prostitute, to be received naked by the bridegroom.[4] It has an outfit, it has dress, it has its slave, the flesh: as a foster sister the flesh will attend upon the soul. But the flesh is "the bride," who also in Christ Jesus experienced through blood the spirit as bridegroom. What you suppose to be its destruction, you must know cf. 1 Tim. ii. 5 cf. Rev. xxi. 9

[1] For this ending, cf. c. 19, and Hoppe, p. 156.

[2] For the preposition with the neuter of the participle, see Hoppe, p. 99.

[3] Tert. is here keeping the metaphor of *sequester* in the meaning of the man who holds the stakes; so above c.

[4] On this extraordinary comparison, see Hoppe, p. 216, with note 2.

is only a retirement: it is not only the soul that is set apart; the flesh also has sometimes its retirements, in waters, in fires, in birds, in beasts. When it seems to be broken up into these, it is as it were poured into vessels. If the vessels themselves also vanish, when it has flowed out from them also on to its mother earth, as if by winding paths, it will be swallowed [1] again, so that again Adam may be given form [2] from it to hear from the Lord: "Lo, Adam is become as one of us," having then truly "power over evil," which he escaped, "and good" which he assailed. Why, soul, dost thou envy the flesh? There is none so near thee, for thee to love next to the Lord; none is more thy brother than that which is born with thee even in God. Thou oughtest rather to have begged resurrection for it; through thee, it may be, it sinned, but there is no wonder that thou hatest it, whose author even thou spurnedst, which even in Christ thou hast been wont either to deny or to change, in like manner also seeking to destroy the very "word of God which became flesh" either by writing [3] or by oral interpretation, adding [4] also mysteries from apocryphal works, tales of evil-speaking.[5] But the all-powerful God, to meet these inventions of unbelief and wrongheadedness, with His wise favour "pouring out in the last days of His Spirit on all flesh, on His

Gen. iii. 22

John i. 14

cf. Joel ii. 28, 29 (iii. 1 2)

[1] *resorbebitur*, Clairvaux MS.
[2] On *repraesentare*, see d'Alès, pp. 357, 358.
[3] For the sense of *stilus*, cf. Hoppe, p. 123, along with n. 2.
[4] For *superducere* in this sense, cf. Hoppe, p. 139.
[5] That is, "evil-speaking tales"; the genitive here has the force of an adjective; cf. Hoppe, p. 19.

bondmen and handmaidens," both gave life to the struggling belief in a resurrection of the flesh and cleared the old documents[1] by clear lights of word and thought from every dimness of uncertainty. For because "there had to be heresies that all the approved might be made evident," while these, without some chances offered them by passages of Scripture, could not venture anything, therefore the old Scriptures seem to have supplied them with some materials, which themselves too are of course capable of refutation[2] from the same literature. But since it was not right to hide the Holy Spirit and to prevent it from overflowing with utterances of such a kind as would scatter seeds under no heretical cunning, nay rather would pluck up even their old weeds,[3] for that reason he has already dispelled all former uncertainties and what they call "parables," by the clear and evident preaching of the whole faith,[4] through a new prophecy overflowing from the paraclete.[5] If you quaff its springs, you cannot thirst[6] after any teaching. No heated disputes will cause you burning thirst: you will find refreshment by drinking[7] everywhere of the resurrection even of the flesh.[8]

cf. 1 Cor. xi. 19

[1] By which he means, as often, the Scriptures.

[2] Kroymann's *reuinci|cibiles* is of course a mistake for *reuincibiles* (under *reuincibilis* in Lewis–Short the false reference, inherited from Scheller, not from Forcellini, is to be corrected).

[3] For this comparison, cf. Hoppe, p. 194.

[4] Cf. d'Alès, p. 318, n. 3.

[5] On all this passage, cf. d'Alès, p. 450.

[6] For *sitire* metaphorically used, cf. c. 28, and Hoppe, p. 182.

[7] For *potare* metaphorically used, cf. Hoppe, p. 181.

[8] For the transitive verb used intransitively, cf. Hoppe, p. 64; for the whole comparison, cf. Hoppe, p. 198.

APPENDIX

Collation of the Troyes (Clairvaux) Manuscript with the Text of Kroymann (Vienna, 1906)

In the *Catalogue Général des Manuscrits des Bibliothèques des Départements*, tome second (Paris, 1855), pp. 227 *ff.* occurs the following description:

(Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque de Troyes) 523

Un volume in-folio sur beau vélin. (Recueil)—Eusebii Emeseni libelli. . . . 16° Adversus Judeos. "Proximè accidit et disputatio habita est. . . ."—17° De carne Christi. "Qui fidem resurrectionis ante istos Saduceorum propinquos. . . ."—18° De resurrectione mortuorum. "Fidutia christianorum resurrectio mortuorum. . . ."—19° De baptismo. "De Sacramento aque nostre qua ablutis. . . ."—20° De Penitentia. "Ceci sine Domini lumine natura tenus norunt passionem animi quamdam esse. . . ." . . . XII^e^ Siècle.

> Clairvaux. M. 40. Manuscrit de 208 feuillets, a deux colonnes, en belle minuscule, avec titres à l'encre rouge et initiales coloriées.

Thus far the catalogue. To all appearance the contents of the manuscript are homogeneous throughout, with the exception of the twenty-first (and last) treatise, which is assigned to one Pontius Maximus.[1] The cataloguer failed to notice the contemporary list of the contents on fol. 1r, in which treatises 16, 17, 18, 19, 20 are correctly attributed to "Septimius Tertullianus"

[1] On this treatise see Dom Wilmart in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. xix (1917–18), pp. 316*f.*

His failure to note this fact led him to assign treatises 1 to 20 to Eusebius of Emesa. The fact that there were five treatises of Tertullian in this manuscript thus remained unknown even to the Vienna editor Kroymann. The credit of their discovery (in 1916) is due to the erudite patristic scholar Dom André Wilmart, O.S.B., of Farnborough, who is particularly interested in the part of the manuscript containing works of Eusebius of Emesa.[1] He most kindly consented to allow me to collate the Tertullian part of the manuscript, and this I have been able to do by means of a research grant which the Managers of the Hort Fund at Cambridge did me the honour to confer upon me.[2]

The Tertullian part of the manuscript is not absolutely complete. The following striking omissions occur:

De carnis resurrectione, c. 27, p. 64, l. 20 (ed. Kroymann), *resurrecturae*
———— c. 28, p. 66, l. 3, *per* (alt.) = 36 lines of Oehler.
De baptismo, c. 18, p. 51, l. 5 (ed. Lupton), *occurrit in tempore*
———— c. 20 (the end) = 64 lines of Oehler.
De paenitentia, c. 8, p. 659, l. 16 (ed. Oehler, vol. i), *deliqui*
———— c. 12, p. 665, l. 5, *non* = 116 lines of Oehler.

A striking transposition occurs in the De baptismo: c. 12, p. 31, l. 8 (ed. Lupton), *-ficit sed alii*
———— c. 15, p. 42, l. 10 (ed. Lupton) *iam nobis in Graeco* being displaced. It is remarkable that this passage = 117 lines of Oehler; also that the passage after which it is found in our manuscript measures 36 lines of Oehler.

As to the meaning of this evidence there can be little

[1] See his announcement about the MS. in his *L'Ancienne Bibliothèque de Clairvaux* (Troyes, 1918), p. 43; *Anal. Boll.* xxxviii. (1920), pp. 241–284. This superb library, formed under the direction of St. Bernard himself, still in great part exists, at Troyes, Montpellier, Paris.

[2] I have to state, once for all, that I have left certain facts about this MS., which are perfectly well known to me, to be stated by Dom Wilmart.

doubt. The original of our manuscript must have been a small manuscript, because it contained only the equivalent of 18 lines of Oehler on a page, or about the same amount as one column of our manuscript. Each line appears to have contained thirty letters (cf. p. 85, l. 8). One leaf was lost from the *De carnis resurrectione*, two leaves from the *De baptismo*, and three leaves from the *De paenitentia*. Also, three leaves of the *De baptismo* which had become detached, were inserted by mistake after, instead of before, a particular leaf of the manuscript. Such losses would most easily occur in the case of a papyrus *codex* like the famous Hilary at Vienna, and if the original of our manuscript was a papyrus *codex*, it was a very venerable manuscript, probably not later than the sixth or seventh century.[1]

It is not necessary to suppose that this very ancient copy was the immediate parent of our manuscript. In fact a palæographical study of our manuscript suggests that it passed through an "insular" stage. The words *enim*, *autem*, *tantum* are omitted several times because the old notæ for these were not understood by our copyist; *r* and *s*, *a* and *e*, *r* and *t*, *u* and *a*, *c* and *t*, *h* and *n*, *n* and *r*, were confused; *et* is fairly often written instead of *ex*.

A different class of phenomena points rather to the still earlier stage already suggested. The frequency of the aspirate before a vowel, and the corresponding absence of it where it should be found, as well as the use of *-qu-* for *-c-* suggest a Spanish stage in transmission. I should propose to identify this Spanish stage with the sixth or seventh century manuscript above suggested. We know that Isidore of Seville in the first third of the seventh century had access to Tertullian's *Apology* at least.[2] And this Spanish manuscript would doubtless be a copy of one that came from Africa, Tertullian's

[1] Cf. Sir E. M. Thompson, *Introduction to Greek and Latin Palæography* (Oxford, 1912), pp. 27, 53.

[2] M. Klussmann, *Excerpta Tertullianeæ in Isidori Hispalensis Etymologüs* (Hamburg, 1892).

own country. But Dom Wilmart will have something to say about the ancestry of our manuscript.

Whatever be the truth about the original of our manuscript, the manuscript itself is of great importance. It does not appear to bear a close relationship to any hitherto known manuscript, nor does any editor of Tertullian seem to have seen it. Until its discovery by Wilmart, it was believed that no existing manuscript contained the *De baptismo*. The manuscript shows twelfth-century characteristics like the spellings *michi*, *nichil*, *dampnare*, but it has preserved many of the excellences of its ancestry in such spellings as *Enoc*, *Eleazarus*, *disparsio*, *obtunsio*, *thensaurus*, *prode est*, *dæmonicus*, as well as the non-assimilation of prepositions in compounds. There are many indications that words were not separated in its immediate parent. One curious characteristic is worthy of mention, namely the occurrence of a symbol like a Greek minuscule omega which occurs a good many times between the end of a sentence and the beginning of another (p. 93 ff.). I conjecture that this symbol represents the ☋ or *cryphia*, which Isidore[1] thus defines, "*circuli pars inferior cum puncto ponitur in his locis ubi quæstio dura et obscura aperiri uel solui non potuit.*" I think this is the only manuscript in which I have ever encountered the symbol. Our scribe seems to have copied it mechanically without knowing its meaning.

The manuscript has been very carefully corrected, principally by erasure, but also by interlinear and marginal notes. The correctors seem to have been two in number, both contemporary with the original scribe. Moreover, the corrections are nearly all made according to the original, and are not conjectures of the correctors. This original in front of our scribe seems, in fact, to have been in places rather difficult to read, whether because of the insular script, or because the writing was faded, or for both reasons combined. The correctors took great trouble to represent the original writing accurately.

[1] *Etym.* I. 21, § 10.

From all these facts it results that our manuscript has often preserved the true reading against all other authorities; for example, p. 39, l. 25, *restruere*, a real Tertullianean word,[1] for *restituere* of the other authorities; p. 40, l. 18, *prodactam*, conjectured by Oehler, for *perductam*, *producta* of other authorities; p. 48, l. 1, *Eleazari*[2] for *Lazari* of others; p. 54, l. 13, *sed et* for *et;* p. 72, l. 1, *euangelicum* for *euangelia;* p. 74, l. 13, *suapte* for *sua;* p. 77, l. 22, XII (i.e. *duodecim*) for *Christi* (XPI); p. 95, l. 25, *credamur* for *credamus;* p. 106, l. 8, *consequetur* for *consequitur;* p. 107, l. 27, *additicium* for *additum* (cf. C);[3] p. 108, l. 12, *qualem et* for *qualem*. It sometimes confirms conjectures of Kroymann and others.[4]

I have expressed above the opinion that no editor has ever seen the Clairvaux manuscript. In this connexion, however, a very interesting point has to be noted. Many, in fact nearly all, of the readings for which Kroymann gives no authority but *Gel*, are found in our manuscript. Now *Gel* means the Basle edition of Sigismundus Gelenius (1550), and the chief asset at his disposal was a Malmesbury manuscript of great antiquity lent him by John Leland the antiquary. By the aid of our manuscript we are enabled to separate the small number of Gelenius' special readings due to conjecture, and to take the rest back four centuries at least. The parent of our manuscript was probably a sister manuscript to the Malmesbury codex, but whether that sister manuscript is to be identified with the Cluni manuscript it must be left for others to decide. The history of the manuscript tradition of Tertullian is none too easy to follow, even after the devoted labours of Kroymann.

[1] Found, outside Tertullian, only in the Latin Irenæus.

[2] Confirmed by *De Idolol.* c. 13. For long lists of examples of this, the true form, see C. H. Turner in *Journ. of Theol. Studies*, ii. 600 ff., ix. 72; A. Souter in *Expositor* viii. (10) (1915), 434.

[3] The *Thesaurus*, s.v. *additicius*, is fortunately right here.

[4] Cf. p. 41, l. 17; 42, l. 11; 44, l. 10; 47, l. 1; 51, l. 9; 52, l. 19; 59, l. 21; 62, l. 18; 80, l. 20; 87, l. 21; 89, l. 2; 97, l. 8; 100, ll. 10, 18; 106, l. 22.

Perhaps the discovery of the Clairvaux manuscript will simplify it.

To save space, I have not given the collation in full as it stands in my papers, but no real variant of consequence has been omitted. In future volumes of this series I hope to print my collations of the other four treatises piecemeal, unless I am anticipated by another scholar.

fol. 157 ra.

explic̄ de carne x^{i}. Incipit de resurrectione mortuorum (*red*)

P. 25, l. 3. (Fidutia) || illam] Sed illam (Sed ill *in ras. et* illam *underlined*) || sumus ; hoc] hoc (*underlined and* nos *added above*) sumus. l. 6. mortem] matrem | parentat et] parent. At hęc (˛*m2*) ||. l. 7. sepultorum—esculentorum] eorum pro temporibus sepultorum (epul *in ras.*). l. 8. negant || pręsŭmant (˛*m2* ?). l. 9. ∽ quoque cum ipsos ||. l. 10. quos] quod (*corr.* quos) ||. l. 13. et *om.* l. 16. non] nostra | philosophia] sententia || empe dodes. l. 17. Platonici] platonis (s *m2*), Illi (*m2 in ras.*) , īmortalem (*m2 in ras.*). l. 18. proxime] + nos. l. 19. euphoribus (*corr. quis* euphorbius).

P. 26, l. 1. (pitagorâ)] + ut „ recenseantur || recidiuā uatū. l. 2. animam || mutatam ||. l. 3. negatam qualitatē. l. 7. Christo] in $\overline{\chi\rho o}$ || seruabantur. l. 7. occultata. l. 11. alias (*corr.*) || participes (cipes *m2 in ras.*) || illorum] + ita. l. 13. ita *om.* l. 15. (her.). l. 16. ipso || carnem. l. 17. negauerunt (nega *in ras.*). l. 18. basilidem || proprie. l. 19. appelle ||. l. 22. si iam (*ex* suam). l. 24. probauimus (*in ras.*) || aduersum] aduersus in. l. 25. uindicamus (*corr.* uendicauimus). l. 25. cuius] Et$^{\ddagger}_{\ddagger}$ ut haec (ut haec *m2*). l. 26. scripserit. l. 27. enim] n̈eû (*omnia eras.*) || eum] ; Tū. l. 28. deum *om.*

P. 27, l. 2. a] a* || et *om.* l. 4. congruente ||. l. 5. et deo carnis auctori ; et $\overline{\chi\rho o}$ carnis redēptori ; hoc. l. 6. exspectat. l. 8. adeo] ideo (i *m2 in ras.*) || et *om.* l. 9. Nūquid (*underlined*) || laborent. l. 10. aduersum.

l. 12. manifestatiorem. l. 14. requirendae a] requirenda ea. l. 17. depretiantibus (ti *pr. in ras.*) l. 19. Defectus. l. 20. facite (e *eras.*) || iam] eam. l. 21. declinari (*corr.* -e). l. 24. [elidunt]] instantur (?) *in ras. 3 uel 4 litt.* l. 26. currendum. l. 27. et] + de.

P. 28, l. 2. ita] + et || dirigendum. l. 4. sua (*in ras.*)* || quos] quo*. l. 5. et *om.* (*non.* ex) || unio] uitium (um *in ras.*). l. 6. defenditur || resurrectio. l. 8. retractatu (re *in ras.*) || enim *om.* l. 10. aliquis || ne. l. 11. ea (*in ras.*). l. 12. resurrecturum. l. 13. *ursus || qua (*corr.* quasi *m2*) || et *om.* l. 16. agnoscimus] ostendimus (*corr.* ostendemus) || adserimus (*corr.* asseremus) |, reddactis (*corr.* reddita). l. 17. in* || que (*corr.* quę *m2*). l. 18. perstricta. l. 19. diferre || et *alt. om.* l. 22. de] in. l. 23. Quod (*corr.* Quid). l. 25. enim *om.* || naturaliter || ut] et.

P. 29, l. 4. deo] deum. l. 5. uiue] uiui || uiuis (*corr.* uiuit). l. 6. etiam *om.* l. 9. ethnico (*in ras.*). l. 10. estis es || fingistis (s *pr. exp.*). l. 13. duce niteris. l. 15. ∽ a te potius. l. 16. confiteri *usque ad* oporteret *sunt in ras.* l. 17. a *om.* l. 19. negauit. l. 20. negauit. ll. 20–1. utuntur non χρ̄iani. l. 23. potuerunt (*corr.*) || simplicitas] + ea (*in ras.*)***. l. 24. conmendat (a *in ras.*). l. 27. et *om.* l. 27. emulamini/festis (/ later)

P. 30. l. 1. incipiunt] + et inde (*et om. ubi in text.*). l. 2. interstruunt] et instruunt. l. 3. fauor. (*sed* u *in ras.*) || sensu⁂. l. 6. inmunda (*corr.* -ae). l. 8. friuole (uo *in ras.*) || ∽ moleste* onerose. || totum (*s.l.* uel i in uel eis tantum). l. 9. terrę. l. 11. in || uocabulum hortem || ne] ine (i *eras.*). l. 12. ait *om.* l. 14. tasso (*corr.* casso). l. 16. rumis (*corr.* ramis). l. 17. lactibus]*retibus. l. 19. et (*pr.*)] ut || luscus et cecus ||. l. 20. an *om.* l. 21. tum (t *in ras.*). l. 22. illi *om.* l. 23. halandum] n̥otandum. l. 24. non || et omnibus membris laborandum *om.* l. 25. reexpectanda (expectanda *in ras.*).

P. 31, l. 2. etiam] erant || spurgiloqui (*ex* spurciloquo) (?). l. 3. experiri (iri *in ras.*). || est *om.* || tam (*in ras.*). l. 5. quique] + petras. l. 6. sensibus (*corr.*

sensus). l. 7. in primis] primus || nos] uos. l. 8. conditio] + quae a nobis (*s.l.*) || quassatus ||. l. 9. munitur || uituperationem. l. 10. depellens (*ex* depellas). l. 11. futtile] fuit inutile || corpusculum (r *in ras.*) || malum] nullum ||. l. 14. igne || extractio. 15. carnis*. l. 18. ei] eius. l. 19. prohibuisset (*pr* i *in ras.*). l. 20. itaque. l. 21. ∽ eius est. l. 22. clariores] duriores. l. 23. figurationem || credunt. l. 25. tantus] natus || mundus] + iste. l. 26. ∽ mundi huius. l. 27. doctore || nec icc. (c ic *in ras.*).

P. 32, l. 3. distantias || prouocamur || ∽ quod omnia. l. 6. fieret *om.* l. 7. manus. ll. 9–10. rerum enim minora. l. 10. eo cui fiebant *om.* || quidem (*in ras.*) || homini] propter (*in ras.*) hominem. l. 15. dici *om.* || prior] priorum (*corr.* prioris). l. 16. limum de terra] de limo terre. l. 18. factus] infactus. l. 19. in *om.* l. 22. solum ||. l. 23. carnis || ut (*and so elsewhere where Kr. brackets, unless the contrary be stated*). l. 24. uel *om.*

P. 33, l. 2. ille || quia. l. 3. pussillitas (a *in ras.*) || limus (*corr.* limi). l. 4. quaecumque sunt *om.* ll. 5–6. ∽ figmentum de contractu (*sic*) dei. l. 6. non *om.* || adeo. M. (*m2 eras. et lin. adp. coniungens* adeo *et* M). l. 7. quae] quod. l. 9. Recogita*. l. 10. ac deditum] accedit) c̄ (c̄ *in ras.*). l. 12. dictabat. l. 13. ∽ sermo "caro" (" " *m2*). 14. et] de. l. 17. Christi] et χρm̄. l. 19. paria. l. 23. excludendo (*mg* uel exculpendo). l. 24. oportere (*s.l.* uel t [*id est* oportet]). l. 25. iudicasset] iudicans · sed || tractando (*sic*) || fidei. l. 26. magnus || molite || et *om.* || adorantur (ur *eras.*).

P. 34, l. 2. et deus uerus ||. 3. non] Nonne. l. 4. superit (*corr.* suppetit) ||. l. 5. deum] + seculi. l. 6. iam *pr. om.* || carnem (nem *in ras.*) || iam (*alt.*) *om.* ||. l. 7. et *pr. om.* l. 8. (non substantia reuocatur.). l. 9. rosius (*pro* generosius). l. 10. terra (*alt.*)] + est || qua. l. 11. materies (es *in ras.*) || splendidor || obsolentiore. l. 12. et *om.* || limis. l. 14. ne dilutior || non *om.* l. 15. propriam (m *exp.*). 16. in] ad. l. 17. carnis. l. 18.

floruerit] f**uerit (? fluuerit *originally*). l. 20. erant || reformatio (reforma *in ras.*). l. 21. aliquando (*corr.*) || feminam. l. 22. cognouerit || ex] de. l. 23. debilitatio (e *in ras.*, *et post* e *ras. un. litt.*) (ili *sunt add mg.*) (*fort. primo erat* di* o / tatio). l. 24. sit] fuit (*in ras.*).

P. 35, l. 1. carne || cum] *eras.* || uiuam de] uiuē / tē (ētē *in ras.*). l. 2. torrere] retorto (*in ras.*). l. 3. limo || ita] + et. l. 4. sic et (ic et *in ras.*) || phigulo. l. 6. pristina et sui iam] pristini etiam. l. 7. et si (*ut Kr.*). l. 8. et si *fere ut 7* || uasculis (i *in ras.*). l. 13. dehatur (*corr.*). l. 14. de / spoliatione. l. 15. confirmauit || haec (*in ras.*). l. 17. afflatu / tu (afflatu *in ras.*) || Quę || et] ut (u *in ras.*). l. 18. et *om.* || num es] Non ēt. l. 19. uti tu] ut uti. l. 21. ne] neque || oblaquees sed] oblaqueasset (*corr.* oblaqueas[uel e] sedd). l. 22. oper* osissimo || de scrobibus auro uenis item. l. 23. congruentia. l. 24. proinde] + nec (*s.l.*) || prospecte. l. 26. moris (m *exp. et eras.*).

P. 36, l. 1. inseruit et inmiscuit *in ras.* || carnī] cum carne (*in ras.*) || congressione. l. 3. adpareat (*corr.* app.). l. 4. sed *om.* || inueniri (ri *in ras.*) || atque dominari *in ras.* l. 5. deo proximam] de proximo (*alt.* o *in ras. fuit uel* ā *uel* ū). l. 6. quod* (d *in ras.*) || proxima. l. 10. fulta est || oderatu. l. 12. perficiens] prospiciens || promisso (uel e *s.l.* [*ie* prem.]). l. 13. studia ingenia per carnem *om.* l. 14. ∞ uiuere totum. l. 15. non (*eras.*) || animae nil *om.* || aliud] + non || sit] + animae. ll. 15–16. ad carnem. l. 16. et] est. l. 17. subiciantur. l. 18. utaris (*corr.* uteris) (*pr.*). l. 20. coheres] + eius || temporulium (?) (*corr.*). l. 21. -norum] + et equidem aeternorum. l. 22. Et haec *in ras.* l. 23. suffragium] in suffragium (u *in ras.*) || carnis. l. 24. substantia (*corr.*). l. 26. possit adipisci *in ras.* l. 27. est *pr. om.* (, *alt. om.*) || caro salutis est cardo] causa (*in ras.*) salutis est caro. l. 28. cum *om.* || deo alligatur] a deo eligitur. l. 29. elegi || possit] + a deo scilicet] sed (*only*) || anime (e *in ras*).

P. 37, l. 1. maculatur (a *alt. ex* e, *corr.* macula

lauetur) || consecratur (*corr.*). l. 2. et *om.* l. 3. et *pr. om.* l. 4. de deo *om.* l. 6. grata] gr̃a (ti *rec.*) || conflictationis || dico] + carnis. l. 9. modestia. l. 10. adulantur. l. 11. noīe (*ex* noīs, e *in ras.*) fidei. l. 12. te*terrimo (^ *m2*). l. 15. uncta || lancinata] lani**ata (i *in ras.*) || lucem. l. 16. laniantur. l. 17. ergatur. l. 19. ne] Illa ne (*in ras.*). l. 20. parare. l. 22. uncta. l. 23. ut retexam] et ea *in ras.* (Nota *mg.*). l. 24. truxit || adflatum (*corr.* afflatu). l. 26. inposuit. l. 27. uestiit || castigationis (*corr.*). l. 28. Hęcine || resurgit. l. 29. dei] + res.

P. 38, l. 3. interitum (teritum *in ras.*) l. 4. mandat. l. 5. facit || prẹcipit || diligit. l. 14. deum (*alt.*)] χρο dn̄o (speraut *habet interrog. signum*). l. 16. omnis uis] hominis || dei] + et. l. 17. uacuissent (a *the usual corrector*). l. 19.* illustratur || adice. l. 21. esaias (*usual corrector* ysaias) || et] hoc (*corr. m2* hęc). l. 23. in hominibus istis] super ipsos homines. l. 24. et *in ras.* l. 25. ne *om.*

P. 39, l. 1. noueris || quo] quod || conpungit (pun *in ras.*). l. 2. ∽ quicquam boni. l. 3. sunt || quia] + caro || aduersum. l. 4. tam̃. l. 5. substantia sed actus || honeretur (*ex* honoretur) || Dicimus. l. 7. sibi *om.* || subit. l. 9. corp*. l. 12. dignitas. l. 13. inducet. l. 14. reprobat. l. 15. probauit. l. 18. negat || poen.] et pẹn. ll. 19–21. de—oderunt *om.* l. 22. interitum || dei] de. l. 23. ∽ potestate et potentia et licentia. l. 25. restruere. l. 26. alia / qua (*alt.* a *est additum al. man*). l. 26. huius] + modi. l. 27. siciant || dm̃*.

P. 40, l. 1. alia] alia / qua (a *alt. add. al. man, ut supra*) || ut *om.* || (credatur? Plane). l. 2. non *om.* l. 3. infactum quę (q; *usual corrector*). l. 6. ∽ deus tantum. l. 9. uerbo haberetur. l. 10. cum] ęquŭ || marię (*corr. usu. corrector*). l. 15. sic et fuisse] nunc || l. 16. fuisse *om.* || nunc *om.* l. 18. prodactam. l. 19. alia,]. Aliam: (*mg.* Nota). l. 21. quanto] & quanto.

l. 26. ″iusticiū (*corr.* iudiciŭ) ę̃″ || quies] qui (as *usu. corr.*) est (*mg.* r). l. 28. ŧ *om.*

P. 41, l. 1. inter (*in ras.*)ficiens. l. 2. existendo || donec et *om.* l. 3. illā (o *usu.*) || suggestum (m *exp. et eras.*) || reaccenduntur. l. 4. et *om.* (l. 5. *opp.* Nota). l. 6. retornantur || mensorius. l. 7. uerna] et uerna. l. 10. quam] q; (*corr.* quae *usu. corrector*) || absumpta *ex* adsumpta |. l. 11. sunt |, absumpta *ex* adsumpta || mira ratio] mirari (ri *exp. et eras.*) l. 13. perdit] + interficit, ut uiuificet; l. 14. Siquidem] + et. l. 15. et lucro damno] dampno et lucro. l. 16. conditō (i *usu. corr.*). l. 17. cognoueris || erit (*distinctly there*). l. 18. abscesserunt. l. 20. Totum (*corr.*). l. 21. mortuorum *om.* (*recte?*) || eam] eandem. l. 23. tibī] ibi. l. 24. prophete || discipulus naturae] ″discipulos.″ ante naturam || quo] quod (d *eras.*). l. 25. ubique] ubi (*corr.* ibi). l. 26. noueris. l. 28. nisi] si non.

P. 42, l. 1. figurat *om.* (*add. sl. m2* (?)). l. 2. signat** || singula] signacula. l. 3. reanimari. l. 4. atque firmissimum *om.* l. 8. decidens || succendens. l. 9. nemo] ñne (*m2 et* ne *in ras.*) 9 alius] + sed (*usu. s.l.*). l. 11. in (*uidi*) || suis] + posuit. l. 12. enim *om.* l. 14. multis passeribus | antestare] an ista re (*points to* antistare *in archetype*). l. 14. si non et] similes (*in ras.*). l. 17. diuinariū || lāniamenta. l. 18. ueniemus. l. 19. dicta. l. 20. istam || sumus *om.* l. 23. ualeat] soleat || probabimus. l. 27. et sic] sed. l. 28. deum] + meum.

P. 43, l. 3. eum *om.* || causae] + suae || et] ex. l. 4. enim *om.* l. 5. iustam. ll. 5–6. utramque—praestat] utramque sententiam. Bono psat malum punit *in ras.* l. 6. istud *om.* || illud. sed]; ″illud″ sed. l. 7. uotum. l. 10. dominus] deus. l 12. quod] quia |, quod (*alt.*). l. 14. homine. l. 16. utique] que (q; *s.l. usu.*) || expugnet (*corr.*). l. 18. destinatori] distinatio | dispiţias (c *usu.*). l. 19. censurę̄ diuinę̄ ||. l. 21. etiam *om.* l. 23. sic (*corr.* sit) (*sic 24*). l. 25. atquin] Itaque.

P. 44, l. 1. utriusque substantiae concretione *in ras.*

|| -que] qua. l. 3. non *underl.* || qualis] non (*in ras.*) || talem iudicatuiri] talis habeat iudicari. l. 5. disponenda, fungenda || quot *ex* quod. l. 8. contextum (x *in ras.*). l. 10. mercedum *uidi*. l. 12. decidit || magis *om.* l. 13. decidit || decurrît || illuc || decidit. l. 15. solos (*corr. usu. ex* solus) | licet (*alt.*)| scilicet, *sed* scilicet non *are underlined.* l. 17. agitur (*pr.*)] agitur (ur *eras.*) || ab *om.* l. 19. suggellatione cogitationum. l. 21. corde] + suo || adeo *om.* l. 22. sine (*alt.*)] si in (in *uid. in ras.*) || cogitare. l. 23. uel (*pr.*)] et. l. 23. -rum *bis* (*alt. underl.*). l. 24. iubi ubi (i *pr. eras.*) || *opp.* princ. sens. *mg.* Nota ||. l. 25. egemonicon. l. 26. *hab.* quamdiu in carne est (*uidi*). l. 27. Qu℟ere.

P. 45, l. 1. administrantur (*corr.* -entur). l. 3. uultus] et uultus || operatur *om.* || inditium faciens : || specula. l. 4. possunt] + etiam. l. 5. delinquentias] dinentias (*' mg.*] nertias *the binder has cut off what was to the left of the* ṅ). l. 6. tebitur. l. 9. deum] sed deum. l. 12. humanaꝝ (*sic*) censureꝝ (a *usu.*). l. 12. eo *om.* || quo] Quod. l. 18. uertant ut uelint**carnem *in ras.* || secus] sic. l. 19. *mon* (*m2*) || quasi *om.* l. 29. nec] neᶜ (c *corr. usu.*).

P. 46, l. 1. eo*. l. 4. nec *pr.*] ne || deputentur. l. 6. Benificus (*corr.* Beneficus). l. 8. quem] quo || ructuarit || frictius (*corr.* strictius) || (arcigalli). l. 10. dampnis (*in ras.*) || obscu*t* (*in ras.*) || eorum. l. 13. cubc̣ulo. l. 14. religabit (*corr.* relegabit). l. 14. aliud *om.* || quam] umquam || inuidiam. l. 16. at (t *in ras.*). l. 17. ministri. l. 18. ordinabitur. l. 19. homicidiᵃ. l. 20. est] Est ne || in (*alt.*) *om.* l. 22. ut] et || argumentationiꝭ. l. 23. rerum (re *in ras.*) || strumentum. l. 24. abunde. l. 25. exordia (*corr. usu.*) || confirmata.

P. 47, l. 1. quod (*uidi*) || tractari. l. 2. ∞ exterior appellatur (or app *in ras.*). l. 4. cap.] *praem.* a || dictum. l. 5. quia. l. 8. ut] et si || est *om.* l. 9. supplex̣ || et] est (*corr.*). l. 12. laudes || operas (s *exp. et eras.*). l. 13. carnis || glofificate (*sic*) et. l. 16. nec (*pr.*) *in ras.* ||

exprobrari || culpam || adortari. l. 17. gloriam. l. 19. auctor || putauit (*corr. usu.*). l. 20. reprosentandam. l. 21. animā (¯ *eras.*) || possessionem. l. 22. *opp. mg.* Nota.

P. 48, l. 1. probauit || eleazari (e *utrumque eras.*). l. 3. ut] et || egeat (ege *in ras.*) || representeatione. l. 4. Immo] + et || agebit (*corr.*) || quā (i *usu.*) (*sic 5 quoque*). l. 12. qua (*corr. usu.*). l. 15. requirentur. l. 16. his] istis || solo (*corr. usu.*). l. 18. anima. l. 19. etsi habet corpus etsi *om.* l. 20. quę proinde || sufficiunt] insufficiant. l. 21. quam] plene/ quemadmodum. ll. 25–6. destinata iudiciis *in ras.* l. 27. possint (n *eras.*). l. 28. animae *om.* || decepunt || solus (*corr.*). l. 30. omnium] conmunum (*sic*).

P. 49, l. 1. patrocinium (*ex* orum). l. 2. tum uires] tum cum res. l. 6. quia] Quā. l. 7. sub subductā || et] aut || *ēmeritibile / ribile (*eras.*) (emeribile *in ras.*). l. 8. impossibile *om.* l. 9. nec || diuinitus fuerit] id a deo non fuisset, ut. l. 11. ut] aut || quia] + non || (*alt.*) p̄iudicatum (*ex* p̄dicatum). l. 12. at (*in ras.*). l. 13. desiderant] de. l. 15. sit] est || apinor (*corr.*). l. 17. cum / ueniam. 18. sententiae (*in ras.*) (*mg.* uel sent [*rest clipped by binder*]. l. 20. sit] est. l. 21. ceciderit. l. 22. stantem] ante. l. 24. membrorum] + est. l. 25. ipsa.

P. 50, l. 1. cuius et reuelari (*sic*) ac (*omnia haec in ras.*), (*haec seq. in mg.*) resuscitari cum animam cir. l. 3. et] + si^{c}. l. 5. cadauer/e nuncietur. l. 6. atquin] atqui in. l. 7. corporis. l. 8. suscitauit] + Cum inflata est, non potest cadere, que suscitauit ingressa, non potest ruere que * elidit egressa (*pro* ingressa (8)—egressa (10) *of text*). l. 10. somnium. l. 11. ne tum] nec tum. l. 12. iactatur || quiescere^{t} (t *usu.*). l. 13. iaceret] taceret et iaceret (i *alt. in ras.*), si caderet. l. 15. despice || cuius (us *eras.*) || insidiat (*corr.* insideat). l. 16. admittam. ll. 21–22. caducae—resurrectio *om. homoeot.* l. 22. que. l. 23. Si^{c} (c *usu.*). l. 24. humanide (i *eras.*).

P. 51, l. 1. humano (*corr.*) || meum a me (*corr.*

meum). l. 2. animae humandae] animam et humans (s *fort. in ras.*). l. 4. ∞ corpus mortuum || erit] + proprie. l. 6. disceptatio || tituli * || ipsius] eius. l. 9. de *om.* l. 10. prescribant (b *in ras.*) || nacti (. *tempt.*) || quidem (*corr.*) prophẽtici (*sic*). l. 13. distorquent (uel de *s.l.*) l. 13. ad̊serentes. l. 17. sepulcro] errore || errore] sepulchro || et *om.* || resurrectione mea (*corr.* resurrectionem eam). l. 18. iudicandam || qua] quam. l. 19. uiuificatus || uelut] üt (*mg.* uelut, *text* = uel). l. 20. ueteris (*in ras.*) || somnii (*in ras.*) || erũperit (˜ *eras.*). l. 22. cum eum] quem. l. 24. consueuerint (u *usu.*) || Quia˜si. ll. 25–26. uae—resurrexerit *om.* l. 27. statim abnuerunt (im abnuerunt *in ras.*)] + Ve inquiunt . quia non in hac carne resurrexit: ne statim illos percuciant, si resurrectionem statim adnuerint (b *usu.*).

P. 52, l. 11. contentionatos. l. 13. figurae] figura sunt. l. 14. ostendens. l. 17. dominum] + ut || praedicentur. l. 19. deus (*corr. usu.*) || Iesum *om.* || et si oblique *om.* l. 21. manifeste] + deum. l. 22. archontibus || tumultuantes. l. 23. pylati (py *in ras.*). l. 25. anna. l. 27. ouis—tamquam (28) *om.* (*homoeot.*) l. 29. sine] et sine || dorsum (dor *in ras.*).

P. 53, l. 1. in] ad. l. 3. perfossus (us *in ras.*) || uestimentum. l. 4. inridentiu. l. 7. profatos aut num] profati sunt? (i sunt *in ras.*). l. 9. reualuerunt] reu***uerunt. ll. 9–10. nec claudi s (*in ras.*). l. 10. si *om.* l. 11. interpretare || uiciatorum. l. 12. et] nec. l. 13. Ostendunt (Oste *in ras.*). l. 14. eo *om.* l. 15. et *om.* || posse (*corr. usu.* possent). l. 16. et (*tert*). *om.* l. 17. ⟨et⟩ *habet* || carthaginiensium || ut] et. l. 18. isrl̃s. l. 19. perorant (*in ras.*). l. 20. recognoscet (et *in ras.*) || ut *om.* l. 21. allegorie ||. l. 22. propheti[ci] eloquii (ci *usu.*). l. 23. si—quibusdam *in ras.* || inquies || non (*ex* nos.) l. 24. et in *om.*

P. 54, l. 1. aequum] cum. l. 3. preiudicare. l. 7. in qua (*sic*) discipli *in ras.* ||. l. 8. prep. (*corr.* prop.) ||

ˢpeˢ (s *pr. eras.*). l. 10. eius] huius. l. 11. obnoxium (u *in ras.*). l. 13. et si] Sed et si. l. 15. et *pr.* (*in ras*) || aperta. l. 16. ⁎omne (*in ras*). l. 17. sui fugerint] suffŭcrint (g *usu.*). l. 19. nec lenocinium] ne de nocinium (*corr. usu.*). l. 21. est] esse dicemus. l. 22. quae non sinunt⁎ (*in ras.*). 24. aut *om.* (*add mg. usu.*) || ab excessu] abscessu || uitae⁎. l. 25. totius spei (us spei *in ras.*) || in aduentu opinor $\overline{\chi\rho\iota}$ *om.* l. 26. + *in mg. opp.* constitui⁺, *but plus it in text the following:* "ęque non licebit" ita scripturas interpręari super illam, ut possit ante constitui; + (*another* + *opp. in mg.*) in aduentu opinor $\overline{\chi\rho\iota}$. l. 27. saec.] in saec. || occasu.

P. 55, l. 4. prophetia || erat. l. 5. illa. l. 6. uentura. l. 9. dirigit. l. 10. conculcatui] coculcata (*sic*) in. l. 12. reliquus (*alt.* u *in ras.*). l. 13. indie (*alt.* i *eras.*). l. 14. et Danihelem *om.* l. 15. in (*alt.*). *om.* || conclusione. l. 17. metū (¯ *eras.*) || et ex *in ras.* l. 20. nubìbus] + cęli. l. 21. fieri (ieri *in ras.*) || emergetis (e *pr. add.*). l. 23. adesse (esse *in ras.*). ll. 24–5. quia cum facta fuerint *om.* l. 26. dicetur (*corr.* dicitur *et* i *postea eras.*). l. 27. parabola (o *in ras.*). l. 28. tenerescentium (re *in ras.*).

P. 56, l. 1. et *om.* l. 2. proximum ||. l. 3. in *om.* || habeamini] sitis. l. 6. fructificat (t *alt. in ras.*). l. 7. frugescit (v *in ras.* l. 8. ad dextra. l. 9. adhu⁎c interra. l. 11. quasi] Qua. l. 13. uiderunt. l. 15. ꝑrectora (p *usu.*). l. 16. excepit] cępit (*in ras.*) || adhuc fugit] auſugit (*in ras.*). l. 17. est] et est || ⟨quod⟩ *om.* l. 18. iam *om.* l. 19. et conculcauit iam inimicos *om.* l. 20. luct⁎ari || et *om.* l. 21. cessari (*pr* s *eras.*). l. 24. $\chi\bar{\rho}\overset{\circ}{\iota}$. l. 26. suscitauit || essetis *in ras.*

P. 57, l. 1. delictis] in delictis. l. 3. rursus] iterum || essetis. l. 4. ∽ quidam quasi. l. 6. et *om.* l. 8. si] si cum. l. 10. ∽ Christus est. l. 15. uobis (*fort. ex* nobis). ll. 15–16. cum $\overline{\chi\rho o}$ in deo. Nun (*sic*) (*in ras.*). l. 17. iohannis (*corr.*) || ait *om.* l. 18. manifestatus erit l. 19. ei || nescimus] ne sumus (*corr. usu.*). l. 20.

sciretur (retur *in ras.*). l. 23. Non || ex] sed. l. 24. iusticiam. l. 25. iudicabimur. l. 26. resurrectione.

P. 58, l. 1. a] *om.* (*add.* est ex *usu. s.l.*). l. 4. adiecit. l. 5. a] ad (d *eras.*) || et] eo. l. 6. non puto adprehendisse] nondum me adp̄hendisse arbitror. l. 6. plane] tamen. l. 9. resurrectionem. l. 12. et *om.* (*add. s.l.*) || onesifero. l. 14. praecepit. l. 16. quem || ostendit (*corr. usu.*). l. 17. potens || Petrus in actis apostolorum *in ras.* l. 18. peniteat ∗. l. 19. abutenda de lecta || Vt. l. 21. praesignatum uobis. l. 22. adusque] atque. l. 23. ore] de ore. l. 25. || legïmus (*mg.* ŧ Sciïmus). l. 27. et (*alt.*) *om.* || ad exp] ade aꝛ̈p. (*corr.*).

P. 59, l. 1. ex] a ||. l. 2. rursum. l. 3. expectationis. l. 4. nostro *om.* || aduentum. l. 6. nostri *om.* l. 7. dormitione] dormitionem ne (ne *est mg. add. usu.*) || merendo || docens] gens. l. 8. si] Sicut. l. 9. resurrexit. l. 11. dei. l. 12. nostri *om.* l. 14. et *pr.* (*om.*) || et (*alt.*)] et in. l. 16. qui (*alt.*) *om.* l. 17. Christo] dn̄o χp̄o. l. 18. aere. l. 21. illos iam] in " illo tam ||. l. 22. modo *bis* || nubibus. l. 23. ? miserrimi] miserrimi ? l. 24. excludendi (i *in ras.*). l. 26. hermogenis (*corr. usu.*). l. 27. eius] huius.

P. 60, l. 1. et *om.* l. 4. quod] Quo || sicut || nocte] in nocte || aduenïat. l. 5. tunc] + et. l. 7. obsecro] + autem. l. 9. illam (*corr. usu.*). l. 10. neque *pr*] ne (*corr.* neque, *et postea* nec *usu.*). ll. 11–12. scilicet — si *in ras.* l. 12. per *om.* l. 13. qui suos (*corr.* quis uos). l. 14. ullū (*corr.*). l. 17. omne] in omne || ∞ dicitur deus. l. 18. ∞ dei templo. l. 19. Nonne me-*in ras.* l. 20. dicebantur. l. 21. iam enim] iam *uel* tam (*corr.* Tamen) nunc. l. 22. agitur (*opp.* *mg.* Nota) || tenet] + teneat. l. 24. antix̄.

P. 61, l. 1. omni *bis* (*alt. underl.*) || et *om.* l. 2. iusticię. l. 3. his. l. 4. apoc.] + iohannis || quem] quae. l. 6. ut] ui (*corr. usu.*). l. 7. ebibat] sentiat (*in ras.*) || illa (a *uid. in ras.*). ll. 8–9. et bestia antichristus cum suo pseudopropheta] i̥d et || certamina. l. 10. abysso || religato. l. 11. de soliis] deo solus (us *in ras.*).

l. 11. igni]^{n} ignē (in *usu.*). l. 14. frugem (v *in ras.*) || exordio (*add s.l.* futuri) | apparet (paret *in ras.*) || aut *om.* l. 15. - o repro - *in ras.* l. 16. et agnitio] ab initio. l. 17. res.] + est. l. 18. quo] quod (*underl.*). l. 19. uindicatur illa corporalis *om.* l. 23. condicionis] conis (*corr.* canis *et postea* carnis) || id est spiritalis *underlined.* l. 24. eam] eandem || diceret (*corr.*) || sine *in ras.*

P. 62, l. 1. respondeo. l. 4. enim] ergo. l. 5. terram] terra. l. 7. sic̄ *uel* sū (*in ras.*) (*mg.* sicut). l. 8. in̦ || interpretandi] in terram extundi (extundi *in ras.*) || si (*in ras.*). l. 12. Nam et (*in ras.*). l. 13. terra ;] + id. l. 13. ut || iuuetur (iuu *in ras.*). l. 14. consistoris || pensabit (uel et *s.l.*). l. 16. et *om.* l. 18. regnabit. l. 19. quam (*ex* quem). l. 20. dehinc subiungit] deinde iungit || uidi (*corr. usu.*). l. 21. uelut. l. 22. uiderunt. (uel b *s.l.*) || enim in *om.* || qui. l. 23. alioquin si] adeo∗. l. 24. existamau^{b}imus (*sic*) (*corr. usu.*). l. 25. liquefieri] eoquefieri (*corr. usu.*) || exultabit. l. 26. sic] sicut || ysaiam (*in ras*) (*mg.*) ysaÿā). l. 26. carnis] terre (e *alt. in ras.*) || intelleguntur. l. 27. deformatam.

P. 63, l. 1. nec *om.* || oculus] oculus non (us non *in ras.*). l. 2. homines (*corr.*). l. 3. ut ad] suis dat *in ras.* ||^{de} fr. (de *usu.*). l. 4. inuitet *om.* l. 6. emittens. l. 9. bullos (*alt.* l *in ras.*). l. 10., domino] dn̄ō || pronunciantē || ne] nec. l. 11. panē (¯ *eras.*) (? *ut text*). l. 13. cęlis || aquam] uinum. l. 14. et uinum *om.* || uigorantis] uïgorē.| rantes (t̄ i *mg., all the rest cut away by binder*) (*in main text* rē· *seems added later*). || $\overset{1}{\text{x}}$ (*corr.* $\overset{0}{\text{x}}$). l. 15. iudaicum (um *in ras.*) || putant (*corr. m2.*). l. 16. interpretandam (*alt.* r *in ras.*). l. 17. uera (*corr.* uere). l. 18. lac || mel ||. l. 19. dei] fidei. l. 20. iudeus (us *in ras.*) || occulto (o *et* v *m2 in ras.*). ll. 21–22. audiens — Hierusalem *om.* l. 22. fortitudine l. 23. primordio dies. l. 24. quę. l. 25. Quę || exorationes. l. 26. aduocationes (occiō) || lapidat.

P, 64, l. 2. omnino] ad̄o∗∗. l. 3. habita (*corr.*). l. 4. terram *om.* || quia. l. 5. habeat (*in ras.*) || proinde *om.* l. 6. carnis || incolare (a *m2 in ras.*). (l. 10. apocali-

psi^{s}). l. 11. ait] autem (*mg.* Nota). l. 13. regnum (14 innube) (16 ys.). l. 16. ∽ dn̄s elegerit. l. 17. merce. l. 19. subsericam] tunicam || palilum (*corr.*). l. 20. ortus (us *in ras.*) || carnis (c *in ras.*). l. 20. **resurrecturae** / *usque ad.*

P. 66, l. 3. **per** *om. nullo signo dato.* l. 5. abitur *in ras.* l. 11. obradiant. l. 12. spem] speciem. l. 13. quesitionem ||^{hi}ezechielem (hi *usu.*). l. 14. me *om. add. s.l. usu.*) || et *om.* (*add. usu. mg.*). l. 22. ego *om.* ll. 23–25. et dabo — spiritum.

P. 67, l. 1. nerui] et nerui. l. 4. spiritum] illum || adonays (ays *in ras.*) ||. l. 7. introiuit || in *om.* l. 9. israelis. l. 14. israelis. l. 16. uobis] in uobis. l. 17. requiescitis (*corr.*). l. 18. sum. l. 21. omnis *om.* l. 22. ∽ israel est || a *om.* l. 27. allegorizare || recompingi os] repingos (*corr.* repingi os). l. 28. et *pr. om.* || populus] populum. l. 29. facultatum (tum *in ras.*).

P. 68, l. 1. respirari (*corr.* respirare) || exinde] inde ||. l. 2. hoc. l. 3. opoinor || resùrrectio. l. 4^{hi}ezechieli. l. 5. et *1°*] aut || et *2°*] ut || ∽ eam in statum. l. 6. est illa] est ; illa÷ (*sic*). l. 8. iudaicus (*pro*-aicī). l. 9. redanimatione (nīm *in ras.*) || ossuū (*corr.* ossiū). l. 10. p̄batur (*corr.*) | potest. l. 13. sibi] ibi || quo] id quod || configeretur (*corr. usu.*). l. 14. uacuao. l. 15. ossium (*sic*) (*in ras*) || quoque] que (*corr. m2*) || credi ∗ reuiscerationem (sce *in ras.*) ||. l. 16. qualis] + et (*eras. tempt*). l. 18. suae + ueritate simplicitatis] sua auctoritate et simplicitate. l. 20. ossium (*ex* ossuum). l. 21. est *om.* l. 25. rę (˛*m2*).

P. 69, l. 1. diffusus (*corr.* diffisus) || senescentes (*corr.*) | l. 2. in eam] meam (*ut uid.*). l. 4. qua | et. l. 7. qui — resurrectura *om.* l. 9. sum. l. 14. figuratam] figuram || desperationem (*corr.* -ū). l. 16. accedisset (*corr.*). l. 17. cecinisset (d *usu.*) || est *om.* l. 20. merebat. l. 21. accipienda$: sed (*pro* accipienda esset). l. 21. sed (*eras.*). l. 23. et (*pr.*) *in ras.* || necessarioris (oris *in ras.*) || a (*in ras.*) respectu (u *in ras.*). l. 24. alibi prophetes || l. 25. soluti *om.* l. 27. orientur (*ex* oriuntur).

P. 70, l. 2. ossuum (*corr.* ossium). l. 4. redaninimandarum (*pr.* ni *eras.*). l. 5. relinquarū || excitandorum. l. 6. et exurgent. l. 7. medulla. l. 9. meo] dn̄i : hęc. l. 12. ita stabit] intrabit. l. 13. et *om.* || subiecit. l. 14. arcus || ęgerunt (ę *in ras.*). l. 15. illorum] eorum || decidit || illorum] eorum. l. 16. extinguitur. l. 19. hęc. l. 20. quia (*corr.* que). l. 21. piscib ; (b *in ras.*) || eructuabunt. l. 24. reuomant. l. 26. nominatur bestia. l. 27. redibitione.

P. 71, l. 3, ionas. l. 4. aluo (u *in ras. et spat. : puto fuerat* aluco)] + bestie. l. 5. utrique (*corr.*) || triduum || carnis (s *eras.*) || tam *om.* || uiscera (ce *in ras.*) || cęti (sufficis.)] + non minus quam (*in ras.*) ||. l. 6. capulum *in ras.* l. 7. bestias. l. 8. hominis (i *alt. in ras.*) || ipse (e *in ras.*). l. 9. angelos (os *in ras.*). l. 10. ultionem] + resurrectionem || Quis * || descendi || affinis (f *pr. et* i *alt. in ras.*). l. 11. quam (*pr.*)] quę (*corr.*). l. 13. dist. (*corr.*)] + et. l. 14. quid] quam (*in ras.*) || hec (*in ras.*). l. 17. -cumque *in ras.* l. 19. instructus || destinetur (uel a *s.l. usu.*). l. 20. ossuum (*corr.* ossium). l. 24. educitur (*corr.*) || omnia] alia * (*in ras.*). l. 25. -ole ergo et animalia. Si uero et animalia ergo nec corporalia tamen in corpus homo quam *in ras.* ||. l. 27. et anima *om.* || ut] aut || amittere.

P. 72, l. 1. euangelicum. l. 2. occursus. l. 7. loqueris] + illis? l. 9. audient (*corr.*). l. 10. iam — parabolis *om.* l. 12. ad quosdam autem] a quodā autē. l. 16. et tamen] etiam et. l. 17. inuenies edisseratam || in] ac (c *in ras.*). l. 18. administratione || cōmendatore. l. 19. iudices (*corr.*) || instantes (*corr.*). l. 20. conuectatā. l. 21. delatę || iudic'e (at *usu.*) infructuositatis (*ex* -us)? l. 22. nec] hec (*in ras.*) || ** tanto. l. 28. retribuitur (*corr.*) || tibi] eis.

P. 73, l. 1. absoluta || et *pr. exp.* || dei et *om.* l. 3. ea *om.* || conpellentur || ad (*in ras.*). l. 4. transactionem et (et *m2 in ras.*) passionem regni iudaici || resurrectionem

(nem *in ras.*). l. 6. espiritalia (e *eras.*). l. 7. obnoxia. l. 8. pro cōmuni *in ras.* || neç. l. 10. utrumque. l. 13. animaliạ. (l. 14. recip. *corr. usu.*). l. 15. ∽ se uenisse || ut || perit. (l. 16. Q)? hominem] hominem? l. 18. est] sit || tam (t *in ras.*) || instinctu ex] instincta et ||. l. 19. ex] ex (*sic*) || cōmisi. l. 22. delinquen- *in ras.* l. 22. ∽ et si. l. 23. si] et si. l. 25. exemplo. l. 26. paene] bene.

P. 74, l. 1. cum] eum || semper] spem per. l. 2. indulgentię || iniuria. l. 3. intelligitur. l. 4. ad quin. l. 5. abundauit || illa (*corr.*). l. 9. efficis oportebat || fuerit (a *usu.*). l. 10. autem] aut. l. 11. in *om.* (*add s.l.*) || interitu. l. 12. saluum (*corr. usu.*). l. 13. sua] suą abte (*read* suapte) | interribilem. l. 14. interribilis (*pr.* r *eras.*). l. 15. quod] quo || et carni] et caro iam et carni. l. 16. et interibili quia id quod perit *in ras.* l. 17. contemptioso. l. 18. hac *om.* || illac] illę (a *usu.*). l. 19. utrumque. l. 21. ex altera] exaltate (*corr. usu.*). l. 23. et] ei. l. 24. est] et. l. 25. quid. l. 26. dubitas || sit *om.* || altera *alt. om.* (*add. s.l.*).

P. 75, l. eam *om.* || sensum rei. l. 2. ∽ dicens ego || ut *alt. om.* l. 4. ∽ mihi dedit. l. 5. illū (*corr.*) || nouissima] in nouissimo (*mg.* Nota). l. 6. et *om.* || ?hominem] hominem. (l. 7. texturam?) ll. 8–10. quodsi—quicquam (*pr.*) *om.* l. 10. Adquin. l. 11. modo. l. 12. tanta] toto || partem || prope totum] pro totam. l. 13. hęc || uidet. l. 15. nouisima || extruxit. l. 16. tribuit || propria] perfectam (*in ras.*). l. 17. carni*. l. 19. Sit (*corr.* Sic). l. 20. manuerit (*corr.*). ll. 20–21. et idcirco credentibus *om.* l. 21. fuerat. l. 23. credę t (u *usu.*) || negaretur iquia (iquia *eras.*). l. 24. autem] enim.

P. 76, l. 1. et (*pr.*) *om.* || prȩcepit || timendam (*corr.*). l. 2. deum. l. 3. possit. l. 4. humanas (a *alt. in ras.*). l. recognoscatur (*corr.*). l. 6. occasio. l. 8. poterat || et hic] dehinc. ll. 8–9. *mg. opp.* Nota). l. 9. humanum. l. 10. intelligam | quoquo] que ** (e *part. in ras*). l. 11. materiā (*corr.* materiae). l. 13. incṛementa (in *eras.*)

|| aliquid ||. l. 15. ∞ etiam ipsum ||. l. 16. opponīt. l. 19. ∞ intelligi corpus || promptum (m *eras.*) || sit] est. l. 22. occisionem (occis *in ras.*). l. 23. anime ** (e *in ras.*). l. 24. non] et non. l. 25. ęternum (u *in ras.*). l. 26. occasionis (*corr.*). l. 28. et *om.*

P. 77, l. 1. habeat] + a deo || constauit (*corr.* constat). l. 2. carnaliter (ter *eras.*). l. 4. ut. 7. aliter || terra. l. 10. : eo quod). l. 11. capitis] capiti capitis. l. 13. humerum (*corr.*) redigisset (*corr.*). l. 15. nec*pr.*]ne^{c} (c *usu.*). l. 15. und (*corr.*). l. 16. flendor (*corr.*). l. 18. propria. l. 19. dignus (*s.l.* uel i). l. 21. resurrexit? l. 21. sic] Si || recumbire (*corr.*). l. 22. Christi]. xii^{cī}. (cī *usu.*). l. 22. et adsistere *om.* || adexteram^{d}. l. 24. elidens] + ne. l. 25. opior.

P. 78, l. 1. argumenta. l. 3. nupturae] naturę || necne] nec. l. 7. confirmat. l. 9. praedicassent] parte dicassent || idonę^{e} (e *s.l. usu.*). l. 10. qm̄ (*in ras.*). l. 11. confirmandos (s *eras.*). l. 13. eam (a *in ras.*). l. 16. adquin || appellauit || ut *om.* l. 18. enim || ert (rt̄ *in ras.*) || qua] quia || non *om.* (*add. usu. s.l.*). l. 19. et *om.* || qua] qa^{i} * (a *in ras.*) (**fuit* a). l. 20. illius. l. 21. tamen *om.* || nec] ne || quererentur (*corr.*) || nupturi *om.* l. 24. et (*in ras.*). l. 26. solidv̄ (v̄ *in ras.*).

P. 79, l. 1. Sic et si carnem ait] licet sic ait carnē (ic ait carnē *in ras.*). l. 2. quia durum (a du *in ras.*) || existimauerant (*corr.*). l. 3. sermonēm (*eras.*) | u' (*i.e.* huius) (*corr.* eius) (?) || illi sedendam (*corr.*). l. 4. ut] et ut || spū disponere^{t} (t *usu.*). l. 6. sed *om.* || ad *in ras.* l. 7. ueli^{t} (t *usu.*). || sps̄. l. 9. audi^{t} (t *usu.*). l. 10. uitam] + et (*exp.*). l. 11. transiet] transiet ** (et *in ras.*) || ad] in. l. 11. constituans (*corr.*). l. 16. pronunciarat (at *in ras.*) urgens (ur *in ras.*). l. 18. proposuerant (*corr.* praeposuerant). l. 19. ad]** || quia] qua (*corr.* qui as) || senserant. l. 20. ait *in ras.* l. 21. etsi] est . si. l. 22. ei *om.* l. 25. quid (*ex* quod) (i *in ras*) (*pr.*) || non *in ras.* l. 26. sps̄ || carni^{s} || -rem *in ras.* l. 27. ∞ inquit hora.

P. 80, l. 3. ex *alt. in ras.* || ** illatus (i *in ras.*). l. 4. quod] cum || ueniat (at *in ras.*). l. 5. monumenti (*corr.*). l. 6. ∞ filii dei uocem || procedant. l. 9. sint] sunt *in ras.* l. 10. monumenta (a *in ras.*) || cadauerum (u *in ras.*). l. 11. mortui] mortis . id est. l. 15. procedunt. l. 16. ∞ etiam facta || qui || debemus. l. 17. mortuis (*corr.*) || suscitantis ||. l. 19. redanimationis *ex* redamnationis (ni *in ras.*) || magnum] + aliquid (iqui *in ras.*). l. 20. mortuos. l. 23. carne || decucurrisse. l. 28. adhuc] ad hoc. l. 29. posse^{t} (t *usu.*).

P. 81, l. 1. at (t *in ras.*). l. 2. nec. l. 3. ne si] si nęc. l. 4. sine (e *in ras.*). l. 5. in] sine || substantiā (¯ *eras.*) || poterit. l. 6. est (*pr.*) *om.* l. 7. corporibus || resuscitabantur (t u *s.l. usu.*). l. 12. uero aestimationem] ueritatem. l. 14. resuscitationem. l. 15. qua] quę. l. 16. aliquid edebant] aliq̇d * habebant (i *m2*, d *et* ha *in ras.*) || in (*alt.*) *add. s.l. usu.* l. 17. aliam] mala (?) (*corr.* mali) || suscitabuntur (*alt.* u *in ras.*); (*thus confirming Kroymann's punctn.*). l. 19. Nam (*in ras.*). l. 21. potius iam] potentiam (*in ras.*). l. 22. intulerant. l. 25. in *in ras.*

P. 82, l. 3. ne] nec (c *eras.*). l. 6. i*|ta. l. 6. resurrectionem. l. 9. prophetąe. l. 10. quoque *om.* || adnunciauerant. l. 12. corporalē ** eam (*corr.* corporalem * eam) || homini ex quiri (s *m2*, ex *m2 in ras.*, ¯ *s.* q *eras.*). l. 13. habebat. l. 14. ne talem] natalem (*corr usu.*). l. 17. inrisuri] inrisu || omnino *in ras.* || si *eras.* l. 18. ·i ęfreq. (*corr.* ię freq.). l. 19. at (t *m2 in ras.*). l. 23. eam] iam. l. 25. dubitatur. ll. 24–25. et (*alt.*) — corporalem *bis scr.* (*alt. eras.*). l. 26. et *om.* ll. 26–27. ∞ argumenta captantur. l. 28. nactae] hanc te (*true text*: nanctae.) l. 29. apostolo (o 1° *in ras.*).

P. 83, l. 1. id est carnem *m2 in ras.* l. 2. exitum. l. 3. est || corintus (*corr. usu.*). l. 5. die et die] de die in diem. l. 5. animam. l. 6. figmentū (*corr.*) || hominis appellatio || ll. 8–9. *opp. mg.* Nota. l. 9. quodámodo || uocabulū (*corr.*). l. 13. siquidē (¯ *m2*) ephe*siis (ephe

in ras.). l. 14. deum. l. 16. dilectionem. l. 16. fidem quidem et dilectionem *om.* l. 17. substantiua || anime *in ras.* l. 18. sint (*corr. usu.*). l. 19. quam (*corr.*). l. 20. hominem] in. l. 21. ac] a *in ras.* l. 23. defecturā (- *eras.*) || isto. ll. 23–24. mortem et usque ad *m2 add.* (mortem et usque *fuerant omissa.*; ad *est in ras.*) ||. l. 25. experiretur. l. 27. illa (*corr.*). l. 28. ibi || ac] de.

P. 84, l. 1. nostrae *om.* || *alt.* super *om.* l. 3. perficit in (cit *in ras.*) nobis. l. 6. uero] enim. l. 8. contemnendus (*corr.*). l. 9. aet.] + et. l. 14. ∞ esse dignas. l. 19. adscribit. l. 20. dicat. l. 21. requiem. l. 22. daret. l. 23. pagine (*corr. usu.*). l. 24. scilicet] + et.

P. 85, l. 4. uexaṇtionibus. l. 5. terrenā (- *eras.*) || nostra || dissoluatur (*ex* dissoluentur). l. 6. manv̄ (v̄ *in ras.*) factā (a *alt. in ras.*). l. 7. dissoluetur] disuetur. l. 8. passiones domicilium consecuturi *om.* l. 9. passi fuerint. l. 13. carni sed] carnis et (*corr.*). l. 14. elegantur (*corr. usu.*). l. 16. repromittans (*corr.*). l. 17. domos (*right*). l. 18. et —. l. 21. diuisionem *sunt in ras.* l. 20. quae sequuntur] persequuntur. l. 22. in *om.* l. 23. super induere. l. 24. si. quidem] + et || inueniamur.

P. 86, l. 1. ad (*ex* ab) aduentū || carnē. l. 2. conpendiū. l. 6. in *om.* (*add.* ad *s.l.*). l. 7. ipse] + ē (*eras.*). l. 8. tubae] et tuba || descendat (*corr. usu.*). l. 12. omnes in prima ad *om.* l. 13. omnes quidem resurgemus *om.* || ∞ autem omnes. l. 14. athomo. l. 15. tu*ba. l. 16. resurgent] + et. l. 17. dispositione || reuocabitur (*corr.* reuocauit). l. 17. prospecta. l. 18. nam *om.* l. 19. etenim] enim || incorruptelam] incor|ruptaḷẹm (e *et* a *usu.*). l. 20. immortalitatem (im *usu.*). l. 22. supra || deprehendimur ||. l. 23. quia] qua || sịmus (u *usu.*) || noluit.

P. 87, l. 1. exui] ex suis (*corr.*) || ut. l. 2. dum (u *in ras.*) || inmutatur. l. 4. lucrifact (a *usu.*). l. 5. nec (c *exp. et eras.*). l. 7. abhinc] et hic || enim] + iam.

l. 9. illam || deuoraretur. l. 12. caelesti] + et. l. 13. deꝑhendu̇ntur (e *usu.*). ll. 13–14. materia et] matec & (*mg.* materĩa et). ll. 15–16. possit a] posita (*corr.*). ll. 16–17. inquit iam] in nequitiam (*mg.* antiquis). l. 18. inuenerit (*corr.*). l. 19. illas (*corr.*). l. 20. existimamus (*fuit aliud uerisim. ante* mus). l. 21. molitum || cū parere. l. 22. aut. l. 23. uiuant. (l. 24. *mg.* r). l. 24. odei] fodiunt. l. 26. olentes] et dentes.

P. 88, l. 1. perennare quae] pleraq̄ (*corr.* pleraq ; (t u *s.l. usu.*)) || fructificaturi. l. 2. resurrectionem. l. 4. numquid (*pr.*)] nūq̇d* (d *in ras.*) (*fuit* nūquā)). l. 5. -tali- *om.* (*add. mg.*) || ingressu || ab *om.* l. 6. deuoratuiri] mutatur in- || a] ad *corr.*). l. 7. a *om.* ll. 9–10. et deuorari ut demutetur *om.* l. 11. potest. l. 12. et] ut (u *in ras.*) || infulcit (*corr.* infulsit[?]) || inueniamur. l. 15. exutos] exiit hos (*corr.*) || et *om.* l. 16. enim *om.* l. 17. parte] deposita uel ex parte || discẽssa. l. 18. dehinc] et dehinc || reinduti. l. 19. carne. l. 20. nisi uestito | sine uestitu]. l. 22. inmoramur peregrin mur. l. 23. incendimus. l. 24. * ꝓfugationem. l. 27. incedentes *om.*

P. 89, l. 1. subiungi (*uel* subiungt). l. 2. boni. l. 8. diuersurus || defecerā. l. 9. significando (*corr.*) || corporis excessu || noue ||. l. 10. a corpore] corporis || peregrinare ab eo] adeo peregrinabitur] peregrinatur. l. 12. etiam] iam. l. 15. pro *om.* || totos (*alt.*)] omnes. l. 17. ut || quae] + gessit *m2*. l. 18. quae] quod. l. 20. reportanda—corpus. (l. 23.) *om.* l. 24. et *alt. om.* l. 25. tali *om.* clausula (la *in res.*) textus.

P. 90, l. 2. * exterioris et interioris *in ras.* l. 4. induxerit. ll. 4–5. -one magn. (*corr.*). l. 6. thesaurum (hes *in ras.*). l. 6. in testaceis uasis *in ras.* || scilicet**. l. 7. utrum] Verum || testacia si || in] ex. l. 8. conditorium] uas. ll. 8–9. atquin si] an quia in se. l. 9. ipsum] + dei || uero. l. 10. eaque (*uel potius hic* eoque)—l. 12. perituris *m2 in ras.* l. 11. uita] +

quae || sit] si. l. 12. est *om.* l. 13. uinum] + ꝯ (see Introduction). l. 17. circum*ferimus (f *in ras.*). l. 19. uita. l. 20. quantum ut. l. 23. temporis uita (is uita *in ras.*). l. 24. qua. l. 27. portas (*m2 in ras.*) et eneas *m2 in ras.* || infernorum.

P. 91, l. 2. resurgimus (e *usu.*). l. 6. suggerit. l. 8. et] ut et. l. 9. adeo?De (ꝯ *m2*). l. 12. suscitabit (u *usu.*). l. 12. quia] Quis ‿ || resurrexit. l. 13. ipsum] idem || ipsum (*alt.*) | ipse* (*m2 ex* ipsum). l. 17. concupiscentias. l. 18. sensus] rursus. l. 23. ideo *om.* || posterior] + est ||, nec caro] carni (*corr.* carne;) *add.* nec *s.l.* l. 25. flatum || aut sim (t *eras.*) || anima] + quam. l. 26. se *om.* l. 28. postumat] positum, adꝙ || efectum.

P. 92, l. 1. priora] + esse *m2 in ras.* l. 2. et *om.* l. 3. et *om.* || atq : ** at *et : in ras. : uix dubito quin* adquae *fuerit scriptum*). l. 6. duos istos || substancię. l. 7. ędunt. l. 8. neuter. rectius] ne utra est citi || totus; || aut^{pr}] autem. l. 9. unum et *om.* l. 10. Exponere. l. 12. senium (*ex* semum). l. 13. prędcepit. l. 17. de ** linquere. l. 18. super (*ex* supra) || neque] ne. l. 20. ut. l. 21. inpertiri. l. 22. qui sit] si quis. l. 23. contristari. l. 24. * sig (*in ras.*)-. l. 25. diem || ira] +* animi. l. 26. auferantur.

P. 93, l. 4. carnem. l. 5. et (*alt. om.*) || os *in ras.* l. 7. ad non] ñ ** ad. l. 9. ad substantialem] abstinatialem. l. 12. concupiscentias. l. 13. pristinam *om.* l. 14. ceterum] + salue. l. 16. exsutū. l. 19. existimet] + et || procurrantem. l. 20. eos] + ꝯ || in *om.* || sunt. l. 21. de *om.* || prauū (ū *in ras.*) intellectū. || adiciens] dïcens. l. 25 incarnaliter. l. 26. ꝰ illos deo. l. 27. incenderent. l. 30. ex iustitia] et iusticiam. l. 31. ex delinquentia] et delinquentiam.

P. 94, l. 1. si *om.* || est] et || est] esset. l. 2. excludendende: || porro — corpore (3) *om.* l. 3. illuc penetret] illud pmitteret (mitte *in ras.*). l. 4. et (*corr.* ut) || quā *ut puto* (*corr.* quid) || ergo. l. 7. suscitauit. l. 8. et *om.* (*add. s.l.*). l. 12. ipsam (*ex* ipsum); ꝯ. ll. 13–14.

secundum carnem *om.* l. 14. Si] + enim || secundum *om.* (*add. s.l.*). l. 17. carnem. l. 18. salutis. l. 19. causa] exclausa. l. 20. *mg. immed. before* lex *has* ☙. l. 21. sps *bis* (*alt. eras.*). l. 22. me] te. l. 23. in *m2 in ras.* l. 25. inualidum (dum *in ras.*). l. 26. deus] deo (*corr.*) l. 27. et.

P. 95, l. 1. carnem] carnem (*ut uid.*), (*corr. m2* carnis) || in *om.* l. 3. autem] enim. l. 4. indemnata ea] indampnate || et] sed. l. 5. obstructa || si *om.* || sensus. l. 7. dicis. l. 8. plane si *om.* || sapere.] capere? l. 9. nullus || intelliges. l. 11. propter carnem et *om.* l. 14. nomine] +.ω. l. 16. sed] + et. l. 17. mundialiter] in mundo aliter. l. 18. enim *om.* || mundi◡alis* qua (a *m2 in ras.*). l. 19. confixum (um *in ras.*) || mortalitatem. l. 20. si non *bis* (*pr. eras.*) || nostra *om.* l. 21. crucem Christi] dn̄ χp̄m̄ || perpensa. l. 22. ut. l. 24. uti] ut n̄ (n̄ *m2 in ras.*) || * ut. l. 25. credamur (*recte*).

P. 96, l. 1. et *om.* || reputate (te *in ras.*). l. 2. non ; (*ex* nos) | tro. l. 3. salui erunt] salus erit. l. 4. cui mortui] commortui || non. l. 5. mortui *om.* l. 8. nos met *in ras.* (*sic*) (*habet* ipsos). ll. 9–10. uiuos (*pr*)—uiuos *om.* l. 10. iusticię · ω. ll. 11–12. inmunditiae] Iniusticię. l. 12. ita *om.* l. 13. sanctificationem. l. 15. ergo] enim. l. 16. confundemini. l. 17. a *. l. 18. sanctificationem. l. 22. nostra *om.* || dī | uellens (¯*eras.*). l. 23. eadem a *in ras.* l. 24. stipendio (*ex* -um). l. 24. carni *om.* l. 25. cui (ui *in ras.*) nulla. l. 27. et *om.* l. 28. regener- *in ras.* ll. 28–9. restitutio ** augurare tur. ω.

P. 97, l. 1. ihu || morte. l. 2. intincti. l. 4. incendamus. l. 5. tantum *om.* || ex] et (*ut puto*). l. 6. per] post || uidenda. l. 7. sumus. l. 8. ita] Sed. l. 10. carnē (¯*eras.*) || mortem. l. 14. ibi *om.* || ubi *om.* l. 15. ω Nam. l. 17. ^{r}sed◡integrationem (r *usu.*) || uti] ut. l. 18. mortale, ita et deuorata] : ita et mortali deuorato || ab] ^{b}ad (b *usu.*). l. 21. abundauit (*alt.* u *in ras.*) || uirtus (ir *in ras.*) || perficitur |, periit |** (iit *in ras.*). l. 22. saluum (*alt.* u *in ras.*). l. 23. languet. me⁀di-

cinans. l. 25. elisum] lesū (e *in ras.*) || sustinens || de — expectamus$^{(pr.)}$ *in ras. m2.* ||. l. 26. municipatum] + expectamus *m2.*

P. 98, l. 1. discunt (*ex* dicunt). l. 2. transfiguraụ̈it (b *usu.*). l. 6. placabilem. l. 7. uiua || sancta || profanata. l. 8. placabilia || iam] nunc. l. 9. ipsius] ut ipsius. l. 10. lucifugę (i *in ras.*) || scripturarum (*corr.* scriptum). l. 11. autem *om.* l. 12. sequitur] et exsequitur || animā (¯ *eras.*). l. 13. sps̄ (*ex* spm̄) || pręsentiā. l. 15. aduentum || est *om.* (*add. s.l.*). l. 17. inquiᵗ. l. 19. sed] et. l. 20. prosternaremus. l. 21. dïsiectis. l. 22. expectent || praecedentiare cognosci (*corr.*). l. 23. * origo || ñ p̄iudicet (ñ p̄ *m2 in ras.*) || ut *om.* l. 27. unde con- *m2 in ras* || ; ω Itaque. l. 28. resurrexit.

P. 99, l. 2. quae *om.* l. 4. uacua est] inanis est et || nostra *alt.*] uestra || inueniamur (a *eras.*) || enim] etiam. l. 5. dixerit. l. 9. uestris *om.* l. 11. in_quis. l. 13. ex (*pr.*) *in ras.* l. 14. paralitate. ll. 15–16. si mortuum si sepultum *m2 in ras.* l. 17. in carne concedis. l. 18. mortem. l. 23. auctorem. l. 24. Chr.] et Chr. || constituerit.

P. 100. l. 2. ω Ordo || dispositorum *om.* l. 7. eos] est || qua] qui (*corr.* quia *usu.*) || ut *om.* l. 9. non (*pr.*) *om.* || non nisi (*alt.*) — corporali *om.* l. 10. quid] ut || ipso baptizare || ait, id est **] . ait idem. l. 11. quae] qui || resurgent. l. 12. sancitur (c *in ras.*). l. 13. morior] mori (*add.* mur *s.l. usu.*). l. 14. ad bestias Ephesi] absentias. l. 15. scilicet] + et || pręssuram (˛ *m2*) (*corr.*). l. 16. ; ω Nolumus. l. 17. supra *om.* l. 18. hesitassemus (–*m2*). l. 19. omnia * || uanam] unˆquam (ˆ *m2 in ras.*). l. 20. conflictationem *in ras. m2.* l. 21. vana] Nulla. l. 22. dicit.

P. 101, l. 2. quoque] + genere l. 5. exhered**auerit (*no doubt* it). l. 6. dei] *. l. 7. · ω Primus. l. 10. et *om.* (*add. s.l.*). l. 11. si *om.* l. 11. dictus. l. 12. nec] & (ex *s.l.*). l. 13. ex] & (*eras.*) || et (*corr.* est). l. 14. tales (*pr.*)] talis (*corr.*) || qualis] et qualis || caelestes] cęlestis (*corr. m2*). l. 15. substantia tales] Substanciales.

l. 16. captabit || atquin] an qui || nulla. l. 17. ab apostolo homines dicti] homine apostolo dicente. ll. 18–19. immo et supercaelestis *om.* l. 19. homo: tamen quia || nichil. l. 21. quiꝯ. l. 22. de *om.* || intelliguntur ||. l. 23. distinatio (*corr.* dest.) || ista *om.* (*add. usu. s.l.* || dignitatē (ē *in ras.*) differentiā (– *eras.*). l. 25. alia (*alt.*)] et alia || tellarum || et (*alt.*) *om.* || a *om.* || stella (*corr.* stellae). l. 26. n̄on (*mg.* uel non tamen in substantia *usu.*) || in substantia] est substantię. l. 27. –tia *in ras.* l. 28. capessandę || subiungit] substantiam || exhortationem] et hortationem.

P. 102, l. 1. ex] et (*corr. usu.*). l. 2. ex] et (*corr. usu.*). l. 3. supercę– *in ras.* l. 4. enim] + eam. l. 5. –ilium *in ras.* || hic portatur] esse putatur. l. 6. non carnem] in carne. l. 7. et *om.* l. 9. instituti. l. 12. in (*pr.*) *in ras.* ll. 12–13. enim praeceptivo] et in (et in *in ras.*) pręcepti^{s}; q̊. l. 13. dicis. l. 14. aut] ut. l. 15. hic] huic. l. 17. constituat (at *in ras.*). l. 18. euirandam (euir *in ras.*). l. 18. adiungant. ll. 19–20. propterea autem *om.* l. 20. est] + enim. l. 21. hereditati (*corr.* –e). l. 22. possint. l. 24. quae si] qui. l. 25. non (*pr.*)] non (t nec *usu. s.l.*).

P. 103, l. 1. ad] a* || conuersatione redarguuntur (arguuntur *in ras.*) ueritatis. l. 3. nec] nē (c *usu.*) || utatur (*corr.* utitur) || constitutus (*corr.*). l. 5. debet. 6. alienatis || quibus (*corr.*). l. 7. praedicere] pręd̄icare (*corr.*) || praedixisse* || agunt] + regnum dei agunt (*eras.*). l. 8. sunt. l. 9. ∽ imaginem scilicet || choici (c *pr.* in ras.). l. 11. quamquam]nam || erupisse^{t}. l. 12. elimandi (*s.l.* eliminandi *usu.*) || dī *. l. 13. pręstructionē (*eras.*) || istas *om.* l. 14. poinde (*sic*) || uelerem (t *usu.*) || interpręt̄amur. l. 15. est *om.* (*add. s.l.*) || * e∪sui. l. 16. bibamus (a *in ras.*). l. 17. moriamur (*corr.* moriemur, *et postea* morimur) || infulcens. ll. 19–20. siggillauit; sed (*in ras*). l. 20. homis∪sis (*corr. et* h *eras.*) l. 22. (*mg.* Nota). l. 23. carni et sanguini directo *om.* || negatur *in ras.* l. 24. resurrectioni || est *uid. om. sed turbatus est locus.* l. 25. carni^{s} resur.– (rę̄sur *in ras.*).

l. 26. enim *bis* (*alt. eras.*). l. 27. edicitur (e *in ras.*) || quem] + uero || subauditu̇ (r *m2 s.l.*). l. 29. nomina.

P. 104, l. 1. substantia^{s} || arceri a dei regno . Nomine (*uel potius* Noie *lineola numquam ducta*) iam (*omnia in ras.*). l. 3. hereditati (*corr.*). l. 5. illi] in illis. l. 6. prodest] prodè ℞. l. 7. spiritum] s̄p̄s̄ (*corr. usu.*). l. 8. Resurgit. l. 9. equalitate || quorum] quō est. l. 10. incorruptibilitatis (*ult.* i *in ras.*) l. 11. quam *om.* (*add. s.l. usu.*) l. 12. possunt || sola *om.* l. 13. cum] + uero ||. l. 14. ad incorruptilitate (b *et* bi *usu.*). l. 15. idē. l. 16. et demutationem || merito] erit∗a̤ || deuotata (*corr.*). l. 17. hereditati (*corr.*). || non possunt. l. 18. resuscitata (uel ri *usu. s.l.*) || sunt *in ras.* || qui *om.* l. 19. a *om.* (*add. s.l.*) || dī ∗. ll. 20–1. ab apostolo *om.* l. 21. qui post] quia apŧs ∗ *m2 in ras.* l. 21. reuelatum (re *in ras.*). l. 25. quod in (d *et* in *in ras.*).

P. 105, l. 1. si] nisi. l. 2. condictione. l. 3. extrusit (s *in ras.*) · ω. l. 4. ipsa *om.* || cum *om.* (*add. mg. usu.*). l. 6. puriora (a *exp. et eras.*). l. 7. qua. l. 8. scilicet] + et. l. 9. se∗ q̄∗∗ sŧ (q̄ *m2 in ras.*). l. 10. cōmis |sv̄ (v̄ *in ras.*) l. 11. seruant (*corr.* seruans). l. 12. sp̄m̄ || relinquit (t *exp. et eras.*). l. 14. illud (*corr. usu.* illuc) || securae] Si curre. l. 15. usurpetis. l. 16. si *om.* || *alt.* in *om.* || cęlo χp̄o (*corr.* χp̄m̄. *et postea* χp̄o). l. 17. nobis || ∗ ita nec (c *eras.*) || inqui^{s}. l. 18. hereditare (?) (*ex* hereditatem[?]) || habebit ? || ut] in || et] aut. l. 19. ex|∗istimes (h *ut puto*) || potius] totius. l. 20. scilicet] + et. l. 22. consumit,] cūsumit ; || posse] ipsos |se. l. 23. ∗ dixerat. l. 25. adimit ; ω || et] et (t *in ras.*).

P. 106, l. 1. ∾ dicens. mors. l. 2. aculeus (*alt.*)] + tu|us. l. 3. ∗∗ deliquentia (de *in ras.*). l. 5. animis (s *eras.*) || sui] ut. l. 8. consequetur. l. 9. ne^{c} (c *usu.*) || perseuerauerit || defutura : l. 11. incorrupta (*corr.*) || hi *om.* l. 12. corrupta (*corr.*) || id est corpora] in∗∗ corpore (in *m2 in ras.*). l. 13. dimittemur (*corr.* dem.) || qua]∗ q̄∗ || habitu] + dic̄ ∗ || in (*m2 in ras.*) || quo (o *m2 in ras.*) || deprẹhendimur (*alt.* d *m2 in ras.*). l. 14.

enim *m2 in ras.* || incorruptelam. l. 16. quī (d *usu.*) *utroque loco.* l. 17. alia || sibi || ut de *in ras.* l. 19. et *om* || cutem] curem. l. 19. cerie. l. 20. subiectioni || nisi de comparenti] . sede c̄ paranti. l. 21. est *om.* || urm̄. l. 22. et *alt. om.* || mortalitas] mortalis. l. 23. efficit (i *pr. m2 in ras.*).

P. 107, l. 2. corruptelam. l. 3. ☙ Videamus. l. 4. derupit || quasi *om.* ll. 5–6. uiuificatur. l. 7. constat || alium (*corr.*). l. 8. erat (*ex* erit). l. 13. erumpīt (~*eras.*) || et (*alt. m2 in ras.*). l. 14. id (i *m2 in ras.*). l. 15. aliud *om.* l. 16. sed] non || et] ** . l. 19. ei] &. l. 21. si nusquam] minus quam. l. 22. resurgit (*pr.*)] resurgat || si non id ipsum resurgit? si non resurgit *om.* l. 23. saluum] saluum? || non est *om.* || ∞ et si non est *m2 in ras.* l. 24. non *om.* l. 26. corpus /·* (*mg.* ·/ ne) || nisi ut iam non nudum *om.* l. 27. ergo] Non (*in ras.*) ergo (ergo *m2 mg.*) || addicium (*true text* .·. additicium) || erit] + corpus || corpore (*corr.* corpori).

P. 108, l. 2. specię (*corr.*) || munimento (ti *usu. s.l.*)] fundamento ||. l. 3. exurget || feneratum] istī generatum (a *usu.*). l. 4. cultum. l. 5. ei] et || in quod] inquit. l. 6. amplicationem utatur || *ordo uerborum ut in cet. codd.* l. 8. puta re] putaui || id est] idē. l. 7. adquirunt. l. 8. serui (t *usu.*). l. 9. conseruat || credens. l. 10. semina (ta *usu.*). l. 12. qualem] + et. l. 13. dirigit. l. 14. ∞ ad denegandum non || communionem] omnium unionem. l. 19. est *om.* || inrationabilis. l. 20. *opp. mg.* Nota. l. 23. ∞ gloria solis. l. 25. stella (*alt.*)] stellę (a *usu.*). l. 26. iudeos || || et *om.* (*add. s.l. usu.*) || χp̄ianos.

P. 109, l. 1. molorum (u *usu.*)] + & mulorum || carnis (*corr.*). l. 2. opposuit. l. 7. granum denuo (ranum denuo *m2 in ras.*). l. 8. *habet* in *ante* corruptela || in incorruptela] in gloriam : * corruptelam (m *eras.*). l. 9. semanatur (*corr.*). ll. 9–10. * in gloriam || resurgit] surgit || spiritalem. l. 14. terra es et] terrę sed (*corr. usu.*). l. 15. et (*alt.*) *om.* l. 16. redibitur || terra. l. 17.

sequestratorum (*corr. usu.*). l. 17. repetundis. l. 18. re consignat∗(*distinctly 2 wds.*) (∗ i *fuit*) (*hinc* ī| primens). l. 19. aliud$^{\&}$ (& *eras.*) || in *om.* (*add usu. s.l.*). l. 22. quidē (t̄ a *usu.*). l. 23. illam || recidiuatum (*corr.* – am). l. 24. -que] qđ (đ *in ras. m2*) || illum (*corr.* illi).

P. 110, l. 1. et *om.* || dedecorationis. l. 2. et *om.*|| exurgere. l. 5. dedecoratione. l. 6. incorruptionē (⁀*eras.*) (*that is, it is looked upon as all one word*). l. 7. incorrupta∗. l. 8. iam foetere] fecerat (*corr. usu* fetere) iam || conparent. l. 13. spiritali (*corr.*). l. 14. Atque. l. 16. uiuam. 19. uellent || quam] cum (*corr. usu.*) || animam] + non. l. 21. resurgit (*corr. usu.* resurget). l. 23. carni∴. l. 25. enim] uero *m2 in ras.* l. 26. ipsa (a *in ras.*) || animata (t̄ ū *usu. s.l.*).

P. 111, l. 1. accedens. l. 2. accedens. l. 5. et *om.* (*add. s.l. usu.*) || eum] cum || ut] ∗∗. l. 6. ∗∗∗ at cum Christum] sed cum et Christo (*corr.* Christum). l. 9. qui denique] quid iniqi (*corr.* iniquis) ∗? l. 10. uiuam *om.* l. 11. homo (*pr.*)] caro homo. l. 12. si *om.* || sed —spiritale. (l. 13.) *om.* l. 14. ecquid] et quod. l. 15. utrumque. l. 16. est] ĕ∗∗ || utrūque (ū *in ras. m2*) hominem. l. 17. licet] illic. l. 19. aliter. l. 20. id est (*corr. usu.* idem) || Adām *om.* l. 22. enim *om.* l. 25. ☺ Quia.

P. 112, l 3. sunt (*corr.* sint). l. 4. prēiudicauit. l. 13. accepit. l. 14. animae—arrabonem *om.* || sed] + *s.l. usu.* non. l. 16. qua. l. 17. qua. l. 18. Quo (*corr. usu.*) || uocata. l. 19. responsa. l. 24. scilicet *om.* || non] + et || ∽ deuorare dicamur. l. 25. ac] et.

P. 113, l. 3. intus] indutus (*corr.* indutum). l. 4. absumitur (b *m2 in ras.*). l. 5. inquit (*corr.*). l. 9. ☺Denique || et *om.* l. 10. sit] est. l. 11. ergo] autem. l. 12. redĭtur (*corr. usu.* reducitur) || ipsa? l. 13. in *habet.* l. 14. deuorabit. l. 15. contentione || mors] + cōtentiō tua. l. 17. per] p ∗ (p *m2 in ras.*) || deuorauit (*corr.*). l. 18. tum *om.* || deuorauerat. l. 22. casse (a *m2 in ras.*). l. 27. enim] autem.

P. 114, l. 2. enim *om.* l. 3. quidem, uerum] quid (*corr.* quod *usu.*) uero. l. 5. *mg. opp.* r. l. 6. ut—esse *om.* l. 7. miscetur (, *pr. eras.*). l. 10. quod *om.* l. 11. esse *pr.*] est. l. 12. quod* || non] + omnino. l. 15. est] sit || demutetur. l. 16. ipsa *om.* l. 18. amittat. l. 19. efficiatur. l. 21. moỳsi ||. ll. 21–22. instare mortuę (*corr.*). l. 22. est *om.* || exalbida] + et.

P. 115, l. 1. fastigium (*ex* fastidium) || in lapidatione. l. 4. in imagine] imaginem (*corr. usu.*). l. 6. docuerant. l. 7. transfigurauit (*corr. usu.*). l. 8. conformationem. l. 9. conuersationem. l. 10. transitu || saul. l. 11. suo *om.* (*add. m2*). l. 12. angeliçum. l. 13. in *om.* l. 17. mercedeṃ. l. 17. per—l. 19. caro *om.* l. 20. fidem] idëm (ł höminem *mg. usu.*). l. 21. dei *om.* || lą̇udere. l. 23. amoueri. l. 25. uacaturos.

P. 116, l. 2. hanc carnem. l. 4. aliam || quam || metat] et ad. l. 5. gratis uita] gratuita. l. 7. non *om.* l. 8. illa (a *m2 in ras.*) || si *om.* l. 9. ipsę̊ (a *usu.*). l. 10. linea] : in ea. l. 11. quis] qui. l. 12. reuertitur (*corr.*). l. 14. eadem] eam. l. 17. cuiusque. l. 21. corporis. l. 22. uiciemur. l. 28. qui] quis (s *exp. et eras.*). l. 29. cum (*pr.*) *om.*

P. 117, l. 1. quanto (*mg. opp.* r). l. 2. quanto. l. 3. nec (c *exp. et eras.*). l. 4. resurrexit. l. 6. et *om.* l. 7. resuscitatorem || redintegratorem || adeo] ideo (i *m2 in ras.*). l. 8. apostolos (*corr. m2*). l. 9. et *om.* l. 13. resci| sionē (ˢ *s.l. eras.*). l. 15. temperauit *om.* l. 17. admittere. l. 18. ex quo] et q̊d* (o *m2*, d *m2 ex.* u). l. 20. obiturụam || resurrecturā (*eras.*) || Natura aduersum. l. 21. defendis, legem] defendit legem : l. 22. adseris] (*corr.* adserit *usu.*) + : ḍō || domino non] deo minus. ll. 22–23. ∞ et sine lege. l. 23. Quo (*corr. usu.* Quid) || ergo || legimus? l. 24. stultitiam. l. 25. sapientiam. l. 26. quia] qui. 27. fragiles || stimmatibus.

P. 118, l. 1. fuerant,] fuerant? l. 2. uestes. l. 3. nomine ac tribu mensaque] nomina (a *m2 in ras.*) hac tribunensiaque (nensiaque *m2 in ras.*) || honorantur? ||

permittes (es *m2 in ras.*). l. 4. ∽ illius demutationis. l. 6. quidem] idē. l. 7. quia *pro* ⁹ qua || qua (*alt.*)] qui (*corr. usu.* quia). l. 8. ea] et || qua (*corr.* quia). l. 12. inquit *om.* || illo (t is *s.l. usu.*). l. 13. deleuit (*corr. usu.*). l. 14. hisdem. l. 16. siccasset || deleuit. l. 19. si] sic. l. 21. auferuntur. l. 22. deum. l. 23. aut *om.* || daemonici (*corr. usu.* daemoniaci). l. 24. iam et] cum. l. 25. suis *bis scr.* l. 27. reconciliatis ira || post *pr.*] in.

P. 119, l. 1. illis *om.* || inobsoluta. l. 2. et (*pr.*) *om.* l. 3. incrementa || et *pr. om.* l. 4. defixit] fuit ** *m2 in ras.* || nec (c *eras.*) || inormitas (*corr. usu.*) || corruptela (*corr.* –ae). l. 5. sarabara. l. 6. ingeis || aliena. l. 7. digerebantur] de die dicebantur. l. 9. qua] quia. l. 10. candidati (*corr.* –tu). l. 11. immunitatem (immuni *m2 in ras.*). l. 12. quia. l. 13. integritatis. l. 14. enim] autem. l. 15. dm̄ || potentiorem (em *m2 in ras.*). l. 18. est *om.* l. 21. sed idem (ed idem *m2 in ras.*). l. 25. quia *om.* l. 26. domini. l. 27. in *om.* (*add s.l. usu.*).

P. 120, l. 1. foenum *om.* || ignibus. l. 2. dei *om.* l. 4. continentia menti (*corr.* continentiam niti). l. 5. potest (otest *in ras. m2*) iam (i *m2 in ras.*). l. 6. solam (a *m2 in ras.*). l. 6. ∽ salutare domini. l. 9. *alt.* in *om.* l. 13. hinc. l. 15. sic (*corr. m2*). l. 16. sorte (*ex* forte). l. 18. disiungit. l. 19. carni] decarne (de *usu.*). l. 20. eidem,] fidem. l. 21. ipsam || in] cum. l. 22. *eidem || adscriptam. l. 23. decessura. l. 24. perseuerentia. l. 25. sunt. l. 27. alei (u *usu.*).

P. 121, l. 3. di*gerunt. l. 4. operarii quique] opera sui quoque || artus] actus (c *in ras.*). l. 6. conceptū (u *usu.*). l. 6. uberum] humerorum (er *eras.*) || decessuro. l. 7. totum (*alt.*)] quo totum. l. 10. officia ista] · officiis tam. l. 13. induit. l. 15. et membra ab officiis *om.* (*add. m2 mg.*). l. 16. nec—liberentur *om.* l. 16. sed] + et. l. 17. desinentur || –que *om.* l. 19. esse *om.* l. 22. uel] et || carie] carina. l. 25. torquebimur || diues] liber. l. 26. aut] et (*mg.* r). l. 27. uoluerit *om.* l. 29. uacatura.

P. 122, l. 1. sufficiat || cum] an || deus. l. 3. debebit. l. 6. At (t *in ras.*). l. 8. po*tandum. l. 11. nomen. l. 13. accepistis. l. 14. habitum et rectum. l. 16. edentulos (*corr. m2* –us). l. 18. in *om.* || qua] quia (i *exp. et eras.*). l. 19. defluxurae] potum (*corr.* potus) de fructu. l. 20. congerentur || An̤ || onera secedant] ho$\overset{e}{\text{n}}$ora$^{\text{s}}$se$\smile$cedant (e *usu.*). l. 21. dicenda] discende (*corr.* descende) || hac. l. 22. quae] qua (*corr. usu.*) || et qualiter uolunt *om.* l. 25. cibi *om.* || potus] + et. l. 26. operationis uictum (*corr. m2* operationem uictus) || sub-$\overset{a}{\text{l}}$ate (a *usu.*). l. 27. subparatura] sui parata. l. 28. *pr.* et *om.*

P. 123, l. 2. dicebaṇtur. l. 4. futura (*corr.*) || possimus (*corr. usu.*) || cibo] ab osse (b osse *m2 in ras.*) || excusamur (*corr.*). l. 5. congressiones (*corr.*) || quot] quod *sic infra quoque bis l. 6* ||. l. 6 $\overline{\chi\rho\iota}$ maritę. l. 7. instructi || ꝯ et si. l. 8. temporalia. l. 9. tempora ||. ll. 9–11. nec homo—dispositione *om.* l. 11. quae iam] qua etiam. l. 12. hic *om.* l. 13. discepta*|tioni. l. 14. inponet || si *om.* l. 15. ullis̤ || succid. (*corr.* succed.). l. 30. Surgit ergo || et quidem ipsa *om.*

P. 124, l. 1. in deposito] inde$^{\text{de}}$positio (de *s.l. usu.*). l. 2. sequestrum || hominem. l. 3. sp̄s (*corr. usu.*). l. 4. carnem] + qui || fę̣deraueṛit. l. 5. confę̣derauit (b *usu.*). l. 6. quis con–] quisquam$^{\text{cū}}$ (cū *usu. s.l.*). l. 7. animā (-*eras.*). l. 9. conl$\overset{a}{\text{u}}$ctanea (a *usu.*) || s :** || est] si. l. 12. secessus suos interim] suos sinus interminạs. l. 13. in aquis] q̣ || in (*alt.*) *in ras.* l. 15. effluxerint. l. 16. i̯nterram || resorbebitur (*pr.* b *m2 in ras.*). l. 17. quasi] $\overset{i}{\text{f}}$actus est tanquam. l. 18. factus est *om.* || uere] uerọ l. 20. dominum] deum. l. 23. deliquid (*corr. usu.*) || cuius] quorum (*corr. usu.*). l. 25. consueuistis *m2 in ras.* || et i̯d ipsum. l. 26. –nē (-*eras.*). l. 27. || fabulas] fabula est (*mg. opp.* r) || Ad (*corr. usu.*).

P. 125, l. 3. et *om.* l. 5. probabilis quisque mani-

festeṇtur : hẹc. l. 7. quasdum (*corr.*) matherias (h *exp. et eras.*). l. 9. nec dissimulare] necdum simulare || ∝ sc̄m sp̄m. l. 10. super inundare (t *add. usu.*). l. 13. quantas. l. 15. inunam^{d}tem (*sic :* d *usu.*) || fontem.

l. 17. (*red*) de resurrectione mortuorum explic*it*.

INDEX OF QUOTATIONS AND REFERENCES

OLD TESTAMENT (SEPTUAGINT)

PAGE

Gen. i. 26 . 13, 15, cf. 14, 22
i. 27 . . . 13, 15
ii. 7 . . 14, 17, cf. 96
ii. 8 14
ii. 19 . . . cf. 156
ii. 20 . . cf. 156 *bis*
ii. 21 . . . cf. 17
ii. 23 . . . cf. 17
iii. 6 . . cf. 156 *bis*
iii. 19 16, 44, 62, 134, 135
iii. 21 . . cf. 17, 18
iii. 22 160
iv. 11 . . . cf. 63
v. 24 . . . cf. 150
vi. 3 24
ix. 5 . . 68, cf. 77, 95
xviii. 2 . . . cf. 158
xviii. 4 . . . cf. 158
xviii. 8 . . . cf. 158
xxiii. 3 . . . cf. 46
xxiii. 4 46
xlviii. 21 . . . 65
Exod. iii. 5 . . cf. 65 *ter*
iii. 17 . . . cf. 65
iv. 2–9 . . . cf. 68
iv. 6, 7 . . cf. 68, 142
xxiv. 18 . . cf. 157
xxxiv. 29–35 . . cf. 143
Deut. viii. 3 . 64, cf. 157
viii. 4 . . . cf. 150
viii. 8 . . . cf. 151
xxix. 5 (4) . cf. 150, 151
xxxii. 39 . . 23, 69

PAGE

3 Kingdoms, xix. 8 . cf. 157
4 Kingdoms, ii. 11 . cf. 151
Ps. ii. 1–2 49
xxi. 8 . . . cf. 49
xxi. 17 . . . cf. 49
xxi. 19 . . . cf. 49
xlviii. 21 . . . 133
lv. 3 . . . cf. 55
lxviii. 2 . . . cf. 49
xci. 13 31
xcvi. 1 . . . 63, cf. 64
xcvi. 4, 5 . . 63, cf. 64
cvi. 16 . . . cf. 107
cix. 1 54
cxliii. 9 . . . cf. 144
Tob. xiii. 12 . . cf. 25
Hos. ix. 7 . . . cf. 52
Joel ii. 28 (iii. 1) . . 24
ii. 28, 29 (iii. 1, 2) . cf. 160
ii. 30, 31 (iii. 3, 4) . cf. 53
Jon. ii. 1 . . cf. 77, 150
ii. 11 . . . cf. 77
Zeph. i. 14 . . cf. 52
Zech. xi. 12 . . cf. 49
xii. 10 . . 63, cf. 55, 128
xii. 12–14 . . cf. 55
Mal. iv. 2. . . . 75
iv. 4 (iii. 23) . . cf. 55
Isa. i. 19 . . 64 *bis*, cf. 64
ii. 16 . . . cf. 50
ii. 19 . . . cf. 54
iii. 14 49
vi. 9 . . . cf. 79

	PAGE
Isa. viii. 4.	48
xi. 14	cf. 50
xxiii. 1–13	cf. 50
xxv. 8	140, cf. 117
xxvi. 19	76
xxvi. 20	66, 67
xxix. 5	cf. 152 *bis*
xxix. 16	18
xxxv. 3	cf. 49
xxxv. 5	cf. 49
xxxv. 6	cf. 50
xxxv. 10	149
xl. 5	24, 151, 152, cf. 152
xl. 6	24, cf. 151 *bis*, 152
xl. 15	cf. 152 *bis*
xlii. 4	cf. 152
xliv. 20	cf. 8
l. 6	cf. 49
li. 9	65
liii. 1	cf. 152
liii. 7	49
Isa. liii. 12.	49
lviii. 6	cf. 66
lviii. 8	66
lxi. 2	cf. 52
lxiv. 4	cf. 64
lxvi. 14	75
lxvi. 22	76
lxvi. 23	76
lxvi. 24	76
Jer. xxxix. (xxxii.) 6–9,	cf. 49
Ezek. xviii. 23	cf. 23
xviii. 32	cf. 23
xxxiv. 16	cf. 117
xxxvii. 1–14	69
xxxvii. 3	73, 74
xxxvii. 11	71, 73
xxxvii. 14	74
Dan. iii. 21	cf. 150
vii. 13	cf. 53
Book of Enoch 61, 5	cf. 76

NEW TESTAMENT

Matt. i. 23	cf. 48
iv. 4	64, cf. 157
v. 10	99
v. 26	cf. 102
v. 28	35
v. 45	64
viii. 12	cf 87 *bis*
ix. 4	35
ix. 17	cf. 107
x 7	80
x. 28	cf. 84, 85 *ter*, 86 *bis*, 87
x. 29	cf. 86
x. 31	31, cf. 86
x. 39	cf. 87
xi. 24	80
xiii. 10	79
xiii. 11, 13	79
xiii. 14	cf. 79
xiii. 18–23	cf. 79
xiii. 34	79, cf. 79
xv. 14	cf. 8
Matt. xvii. 3–8	cf. 143
xix. 12	66, cf. 157
xix. 17	23
xix. 19	cf. 23
xix 26	148
xix 28	cf. 87
xx. 1–16	cf. 21
xxii. 11	cf. 66, 87
xxii. 13	cf. 87
xxii. 21	cf. 55
xxii. 23–28	cf. 88
xxii. 23–33	cf. 2
xxii. 29	cf. 88
xxii. 30	159, cf. 158 *ter*
xxii. 37, 39	cf. 23
xxiii. 27	cf. 47
xxiii. 37	cf. 65
xxiv. 2	cf. 53
xxiv. 3	cf. 53
xxiv. 5–31	cf. 53
xxiv. 24	cf. 52
xxiv. 32	cf. 54

	PAGE
Matt. xxiv. 36	cf. 52
xxv. 46	cf. 86
xxvi. 15	cf. 49
xxvi. 38	cf. 44
xxvi. 67	cf. 49
xxvii. 9	cf. 49
xxvii. 34	cf. 49
xxvii. 35	cf 49
xxvii. 39	cf. 49
Mark xvi. 19	cf. 128
Luke v. 31	23
xiii. 6-9	cf. 80
xiv. 14	80
xv. 4–6	cf. 81
xvi. 23–26	cf 40
xviii 1–8	cf. 79
xviii. 9	79
xix. 10	23, cf. 81
xx. 36	88, 89, cf. 102
xx. 37	88
xxi. 6	cf. 53
xxi. 7	cf. 53
xxi. 8–28	cf. 53
xxi. 20	cf. 53
xxi. 24	53
xxi. 25–28	53
xxi. 25	cf 52
xxi 28	cf. 54
xxi. 31	54
xxi 36	54
xxiv. 26	cf. 94
xxiv. 39, 40	cf. 49
John i. 3	cf. 13
i 9	cf. 106, 152
i. 14	160, cf. 15, 90, 91
ii. 21	44, cf. 44
iii. 19	44
v. 15	91
v. 24	90
v. 28, 29	91
vi 29	cf 84
vi. 31	cf. 90
vi. 38	83
vi. 39	83, 87, cf. 83
vi 40	83
vi. 51	cf. 64, 90
John vi. 52, 56	cf 89
vi. 60	cf. 89
vi. 63	89 *ter*, 90, cf. 89, 90 *ter*, 127
x. 43	cf. 67
xi. 1–18	cf. 135
xi. 17	cf. 135 *bis*
xi 39	cf. 135 *ter*
xi. 44	cf. 135 *bis*
xiv 2	cf. 100
xv 1	cf. 65
xix. 37	63, cf. 128
xx. 29	cf. 84
Acts i. 11	cf. 55, 128
iii. 19–21	58
iii 21	58
vi. 15	cf. 143
vii. 56	cf. 128
vii. 59	cf. 143
vii. 60	cf. 143
ix. 15	57
xv. 16	cf. 25
xvii. 32	cf. 95
xxii. 29, 30	cf. 94
xxiii. 6	94, cf. 94
xxvi. 22	cf. 94
xxvi. 23	cf. 95
Rom. i. 25	cf. 64
ii. 25, 27	cf. 94
ii. 28, 29	65
iv. 11	cf. 46
iv. 16	cf. 46
v. 20	cf. 82, 117
v. 21	117
vi. 3, 4	116
vi. 5	117
vi. 6	115 *ter*
vi. 8	cf. 115
vi. 11	115
vi. 12, 13	115
vi. 14	cf. 148
vi. 19–23	cf. 116
vii. 17	cf. 114 *bis*
vii. 18	cf. 24
vii. 23	cf. 113, 130
viii. 1	cf. 39
viii. 2	113, cf. 114 *ter*

	PAGE
Rom. viii. 3	114, cf. 39
viii. 6, 7	cf. 114
viii. 8	24, cf. 112
viii. 9	112
viii. 10	cf. 112
viii. 11	113
viii. 12, 13	113
viii. 17, 18	98
ix. 11	cf. 63
ix. 20	18
xii. 1	cf. 118
xiv. 10	cf 154
1 Cor. i. 27	148
ii. 9	64
ii 14	cf. 52
iii. 16	cf. 107
iii. 19	cf. 8
iii. 22	151
vi. 15	24
vi. 19	cf. 24
vi. 20	39, cf. 24
vii. 31	13, cf. 65, 76
ix. 10	cf. 151
x. 11	cf. 67
xi. 19	cf. 96, 161
xii. 23	23
xv. 3, 4	cf. 120
xv. 12-18	119
xv. 12	46
xv. 14	cf. 46
xv. 19	cf. 59
xv. 21	120
xv 22	120
xv. 23	120
xv. 26	cf. 130
xv. 29	cf. 121 *bis*
xv. 30	121
xv. 31	121
xv. 32	126, cf. 121
xv. 34	cf. 91
xv. 35	122, cf. 131
xv. 36	131, cf. 131
xv. 37, 38	131
xv. 37	131 *bis*
xv. 38	132
xv. 39	133 *ter*
xv. 40, 41	123

	PAGE
1 Cor. xv. 40	cf. 133
xv. 41	131
xv. 42–44	134
xv. 42	134
xv. 42, 43	cf. 135
xv. 43	cf. 135
xv 44	135 *bis*, 137, 138, 139, cf. 136 *sexiens*, 137 *ter*, 138, 139, 154
xv. 45	137 *quater*, 138 *bis*, cf. 123, 128, 136, 137
xv. 46	137, 138 *bis*
xv. 47	122, 138
xv. 48	123
xv. 49	124, 125, cf. 125
xv. 50	118, 125 *bis*, 126 *bis*, 127, 129, 130, cf. 126, 127 *bis*, 129
xv. 51, 52	101
xv. 51	cf. 101
xv. 52	130, 147
xv. 53, 54	cf. 127 *bis*
xv. 53	101, 130, 140, cf. 130 *bis*, 140, 147 *bis*, 154
xv. 55, 56	129
xv. 55	117, 140
2 Cor. i. 8	121, cf. 121
i. 22	cf. 139
ii. 10	cf. 106
iv. 6	106
iv. 7	18, cf. 106
iv. 10	107, cf. 107
iv. 11	107 *ter*, 108, cf. 108 *bis*
iv. 14	108
iv. 16	96, 98, cf. 39, 96 *bis*, 97 *quinquiens*, 98, 99 *bis*, 105, 106
iv. 17, 18	97
iv. 17	cf. 98
v. 1	99, 100, cf. 100
v. 2, 3	100
v. 2, 4	cf. 101
v. 2	cf. 104 *bis*

PAGE

2 Cor. v. 3, 4 . . cf. 102
v. 3 104
v. 4 . 102, 139, cf. 25, 103 *bis*, 140 *bis*
v. 5 . . cf. 129 *bis*, 139
v. 6, 7 104
v. 6 105
v. 7 . . cf. 105 *bis*
v. 8 105
v. 9, 10 105
v. 10 . . 105, 106, 154
vii. 5 . . . 98, 99
xi. 14 . . . cf. 143
xii. 2 . . . cf. 143
xii. 9 . . . 23 cf. 117
Gal. i. 16 . . . cf. 128
iii. 27 . cf 8, 47, 65, 145
v. 5 . . 56, cf. 139
v. 17 24
v. 19 . . . cf. 110
v. 21 . . . cf. 125
vi. 9 . . . 57 *bis*
vi. 17 24
Eph. iii. 16, 17 . . . 96
iii. 17 . . . 96, 97
iv. 22–24 . cf. 108 *bis*
iv. 22, 24 . . cf. 111
iv. 22 . 110, cf. 47, 109 *bis*, 110, 111 *quater*, 124, 125, 126
iv. 23, 24 . . cf. 97
iv. 24 . . 124, cf. 109
iv. 25–32 . . . 110
vi. 11–17 . . cf. 8
vi. 12 . . . cf. 55
Phil. ii. 6 15
iii. 11, 12 . . . 57
iii. 12 57
iii. 13, 14 . . . 57
iii. 20 . . . cf. 118
iii. 21 . . . 118, 143
Col. i. 21 . . . cf. 55
ii. 11 . . . cf. 18
ii. 12 . . . cf. 55
ii. 13 55
ii. 20 . . . 55, 114

PAGE

Col. iii. 1, 2 . . . 56
iii. 3 56
iii. 9 . . . cf. 91
1 Thess. i. 9, 10 . . 58
ii. 19 58
iii. 13 58
iv. 4 39
iv. 13–18 . . cf. 147
iv. 13 . . . cf. 58
iv. 14-17 . . . 58
iv. 15–17 . . . 100
iv. 16 . . . 59 *ter*
v. 1–3 59
v. 23 . . . 118 *ter*
2 Thess. ii. 1–7 . . . 60
ii. 8–10 . . . 60
1 Tim. i. 19 . . cf. 59
ii. 5 . . 128, cf. 159
ii. 7 57
vi. 14, 15 . . . 57
2 Tim. i. 15 . . cf. 59
i. 18 57
Heb. iv. 13 . . cf. 9
James ii. 23 . . f. 46
1 John iii. 2 . . . 56
Rev. i. 18 . . . cf. 118
ii. 7 . . . cf. 87
iii. 4 . . . cf. 66
iii. 5 . . . cf. 66
vi. 9, 10 . . cf. 61
vi. 9 . . . cf. 92
vii. 17 149
xii. 6 . . . cf. 55
xiv. 4 . . . cf. 66
xv. 6, 7 . . . cf. 61
xvii. 12 . . . cf. 60, 61
xviii. 9, 10 . . cf. 55
xix. 13 122
xix. 20 . . . cf. 61
xx. 2, 3 . . . cf. 61
xx. 4 . . . cf. 61
xx. 10 . . cf. 61, 149
xx. 12 . . . cf. 61
xxi. 4 . . . 149 *bis*
xxi. 9 . . . cf. 159

OTHER AUTHORS

	PAGE
Epicurus (Usener, No. 336)	2
Plato, *Phaedr.*, c. 24, p. 245	7
Seneca, *Troades*, 397	2, 8
Tertullian, *De Anima*	cf. 7, 11 (?)
,, ,, 5 ff.	cf. 40
,, ,, 27	cf. 109
Tertullian, *De Anima*, 51	cf. 103
,, *De Carne Christi*	cf. 6
,, *Adv. Marcionem*:	
i. ii.	cf. 32
ii. iii.	cf. 6

INDEX OF LATIN WORDS

Absum : absit ut, 22 n. 8
ac si, 60 n. 1, 141 n. 7
adhuc, 26 n. 2, 35 n. 5, 62 n. 2, 147 n. 1
admitto, 45 n 4
aduocatio, 65 n. 3
aemulus, 140 n. 7
aequus : ex aequo, 127 n. 1
alienus, 107 n. 1
aliquis, 6 n. 5, 7 n. 7
alius ab, 8 n. 3
alterutrum, 110 n. 3, 111 n. 1
an (double), 33 n. 3
angelifico, 64 n. 1
animalis, 52 n. 3
ante, 136 n. 2
antisto, 86 n. 3, 156 n. 1
aries, 11 n. 7
attinet omitted, 5 n. 1

caedo, 141 n. 3
caelestis, 64 n. 4
cano, 75 n. 1
capax, 32 n. 1
carina, 155 n. 1
cauillor, 52 n. 1, 85 n. 1
ceterus : de cetero, 94 n. 3
choicus, 122 n. 4
circa, 59 n. 1
citra, 95 n. 1, 121 n 4
commendo, 14 n. 1, 93 n. 4
communico, 38 n. 7
competo, 116 n. 1, 136 n. 4
conceptiuus, 97 n. 1
conclusio, 53 n. 1
condimentum, 67 n. 3
conditio, 26 n. 4, 30 n. 4, 64 n. 3
configuro, 73 n. 1
consecro, 35 n. 2
consecutio, 134 n. 3
contrarius : e contrario, 27 n. 2, 144 n. 3
corpulentia, 40 n. 2
credo, 26 n. 3, 111 n. 4
cum (causal), 50 n. 1

de, 16 n. 4, 30 n. 9, 31 n. 4, 31 n. 5, 31 n. 7
decerpo, 42 n. 1
dedico, 157 n. 3
deficio, 127 n. 2
dehaurio, 27 n. 4
deprehendo, 101 n. 4
destinatio, 33 n 4
detergeo, 44 n. 1
detexo, 106 n. 2
dignus, 54 n. 2
discutio, 47 n. 2
dispungo, 34 n. 4, 144 n. 2, 150 n. 4
dissipo, 51 n. 2
do, 41 n. 1
dubito, 30 n. 2

ebrius, 38 n. 2
educatus, 154 n. 1
Eleazarus, 40 n. 6
enim, 111 n. 3
erogo, 22 n. 1
et ("and yet"), 150 n. 3
ex, 137 n. 2
excudo, 15 n. 4
excuso, 157 n. 5
expono, 110 n. 1, 124 n. 2
expungo, 100 n. 2
extraneus, 40 n. 1

habeo, 55 n. 1, 66 n. 3, 72 n 2, 88 n. 4, 95 n. 2, 97 n. 5, 98 n. 2, 103 n. 5
hactenus, 16 n. 3, 149 n. 2, 155 n. 6
hinc, 33 n. 1

iactito, 45 n. 1
idoneus, 27 n. 5, 32 n. 2
impingo, 108 n. 2
in (c. acc.), 29 n. 6, 93 n. 5; (c. abl.), 57 n. 2, 93 n. 2, 157 n. 4
incolo (1 conj), 66 n. 1
incredulus, 88 n. 2
induo, 63 n. 2, cf. 111 n. 5
infirmus, 26 n. 8
infulcio, 104 n. 1
infusco, 23 n. 3
ingenium, 43 n. 1
ingero, 83 n. 1, 108 n. 1, 115 n. 4
inlumino, 90 n. 3
instar : ad instar, 80 n. 1
instrumentum, 93 n. 6
intentio, 75 n. 4
interficio, 28 n. 3
interstruo, 9 n. 2
inuicem, 111 n. 2
iste = ille, 6 n. 6, *= hic*, 32 n. 5

lapsus, 153 n. 2
libidinosus, 78 n. 1
libido, 156 n. 3

macellum, 156 n. 2
manifestus, 75 n. 2
medius : in medio, 47 n. 1
ministerium, 37 n. 1
mors, 28 n. 4, 37 n. 3

nato, 11 n. 2
ne—quoque, 18 n. 2
nisi forte, 154 n. 5
nomen : nomine, 39 n. 1, 68 n. 4, 72 n. 5, 114 n. 2, 126 n. 1
non, 8 n. 5
nubilus, 38 n. 1, 50 n. 3, 69 n. 1

obduco, 4 n. 1
obtundo, obtunsio, 146 n. 2
offusco (etc.), 104 n. 4
operatio, 12 n. 3
opertus, 87 n. 1
opinor, 72 n. 7
optimus, 110 n. 4

pareo, 34 n. 3
pario (1 conj.), 138 n. 1
peculiaris, 30 n. 7
perditus, 82 n. 1
persuadeo, 51 n. 5
porro, 96 n. 3, 141 n. 5
possum, 109 n. 2, 142 n. 1
post, 12 n. 6, 150 n. 1
potaculum, 11 n. 1
poto, 161 n. 7
praeconium, 25 n. 1, 46 n. 3, 95 n. 3
praeiudico, 138 n. 3
praestruo, 154 n. 3
praesum, 32 n. 4
praetimeo, 86 n. 1
prior, 62 n. 4
prodigo, 27 n. 3
prouoco, 12 n. 1
pulso, 2 n. 3
purus ab, 50 n. 2
pusillitas, 14 n. 3

qualis : quale est, 145 n. 1
quamquam, 44 n. 2, 45 n. 3
quanti (plur.), 102 n. 2
quasso, 11 n. 8
quatenus, 156 n. 5
quatio, 71 n. 3
quia, 56 n. 1
quocumque, 27 n. 4
quod, 10 n. 3, 26 n. 7, 59 n. 2, 140 n. 4

recorporatio, 72 n. 8
recorporo, 76 n. 1
redanimatio, 72 n. 9, 92 n. 1
redanimo, 30 n. 5, 76 n. 1
redintegrator, 147 n. 2
religiosus, 77 n. 5

repraesentatio, 34 n. 2, 41 n. 4, 54 n. 3, 56 n. 3
repraesento, 3 n. 1, 40 n. 3, 160 n. 2
requietus, 77 n. 3
resigno, 94 n. 2
respiratio, 93 n. 5
respiro, 72 n. 4
respuo, 88 n. 1
resuscitator, 30 n. 1
retexo, 22 n. 3, 136 n. 1
retractatus, 6 n. 4
reuincibilis, 161 n. 2
reuinco, 128 n. 2
reuoluo, 28 n. 7

sacramentum, 22 n. 5, 61 n. 4
sacrilegus, 103 n. 2
sagino, 21 n. 3
salus, 150 n. 2
satis, 69 n. 5
scriptura, 42 n. 5
se : sui, 51 n. 7
securus, 31 n. 7
sed, 32 n. 3, 86 n. 2, 92 n. 2, 154 n. 4
semel, 29 n 4, 31 n. 6, 144 n. 5
sequester, 159 n. 3
si = num, 33 n 2, 70 n. 1, see *ac si quidem*, 29 n. 2, 30 n. 6, 100 n. 1
similitudo, 73 n. 2
sitio, 26 n. 1, 69 n. 2, 161 n. 6
stabulum, 153 n. 8
sterno, 61 n. 1
stilus, 7 n. 1, 24 n. 2, 52 n. 5, 160 n. 3
struo, 157 n. 6
succido, 143 n. 3, 158 n. 3
sufficio, 156 n. 4
suffundo, 157 n. 1
suggestus, 97 n. 4, 112 n. 1, 133 n. 1
sum : est c. infin., 7 n. 5, 38 n. 6, 157 n. 7
super quam supra, 121 n. 3
superbia, 132 n. 2
superduco, 160 n. 4
suspiro, 52 n. 6
suus : de suo, 41 n. 3

torqueo, 95 n. 4, 155 n. 4
totus : in totum, 141 n. 4, 142 n. 3
transgressio, 124 n. 1

uacatio, 155 n. 8
uaco, 40 n. 2, 61 n. 3; *uacuisset*, 23 n. 2
ualentia, 70 n. 4
uernus : uerna, 28 n. 6
uerus : in uero, 26 n. 10, 47 n. 1
uiscera, 73 n. 4
usque quaque, 90 n 2
ut, 64 n. 2; *ut qui*, 109 n. 3
utrumne—an, 19 n. 3, 106 n. 1, n. 3

NOTES ON THE TEXT

Appendix *passim :* also pp. 3 n. 5; 4 n. 2; 6 n. 3; 9 n. 3; 13 n. 2; 21 n. 5; 25 n. 2; 26 n. 1; 27 n. 3; 33 n. 4; 38 n. 3; 40 n. 6; 48 n. 2; 53 n. 1; 56 n. 2; 63 n. 1; 65 n. 1; 70 n. 2; 70 n 3; 73 n. 6; 74 n. 1; 75 n. 5; 75 n. 6; 75 n. 7; 77 n. 4; 80 n. 3; 84 n. 1; 85 n. 2; 87 n. 1; 87 n. 2; 92 n. 3; 93 n. 1; 93 n. 3; 97 n. 3; 97 n. 6; 99 n. 1; 99 n. 3; 101 n. 1; 101 n. 2; 101 n. 3; 111 n. 3; 113 n. 3; 114 n. 1; 115 n. 3; 117 n. 1; 122 n. 2; 122 n. 3; 130 n. 1; 131 n. 2; 132 n. 1; 138 n. 3; 140 n. 3; 141 n. 1; 151 n. 3; 160 n. 1; 161 n. 2.

CAMBRIDGE

Printed in Great Britain by
Richard Clay & Sons, Limited,
bungay, suffolk.

PUBLICATIONS

OF THE

S. P. C. K.

BOOKS FOR STUDENTS AND OTHERS

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING
CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE

LONDON: 9 NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C. 2
Book Shops: 64 NEW BOND STREET, W. 1
43 QUEEN VICTORIA STREET, E.C. 4
BRIGHTON: 129 NORTH STREET. BATH: 39 GAY STREET
New York: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
Toronto: THE MACMILLAN CO. OF CANADA, LTD.
And of all Booksellers.

BOOKS FOR STUDENTS

Translations of Early Documents

A Series of texts important for the study of Christian origins. Under the Joint Editorship of the Rev. W. O. E. Oesterley, D.D., and the Rev. Canon G. H. Box, D.D.

The object of this Series is to provide short, cheap, and handy textbooks for students, either working by themselves or in classes. The aim is to furnish in translations important texts unencumbered by commentary or elaborate notes, which can be had in larger works.

FIRST SERIES—Palestinian-Jewish and Cognate Texts (Pre-Rabbinic)

1. **Jewish Documents of the Time of Ezra**
   Translated from the Aramaic by A. E. Cowley, Litt.D., Sub-Librarian of the Bodleian Library, Oxford. 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

2. **The Wisdom of Ben-Sira (Ecclesiasticus)**
   By the Rev. W. O. E. Oesterley, D.D., Vicar of St. Alban's, Bedford Park, W.; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of London. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

3. **The Book of Enoch**
   By the Rev. R. H. Charles, D.D., Canon of Westminster. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

4. **The Book of Jubilees**
   By the Rev. Canon Charles. 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

5. **The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs**
   By the Rev. Canon Charles. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

6. **The Odes and Psalms of Solomon**
   By the Rev. G. H. Box, D.D., Rector of Sutton, Beds., Hon. Canon of St. Albans.

7. **The Ascension of Isaiah**
   By the Rev. Canon Charles. Together with No. 10 in one volume. 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

8. **The Apocalypse of Ezra (ii. Esdras)**
   By the Rev. Canon Box. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

9. **The Apocalypse of Baruch**
   By the Rev. Canon Charles. Together with No. 12 in one volume. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

10. **The Apocalypse of Abraham**
    By the Rev. Canon Box. Together with No. 7 in one volume. 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

11. **The Testaments of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob**
    By the Rev. Canon Box and S. Gaselee.

12. **The Assumption of Moses**
    By Rev. W. J. Ferrar, M.A. With No. 9 in one volume. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

13. **The Biblical Antiquities of Philo**
    By M. R. James, Litt.D., F.B.A., Hon. Litt.D., Dublin, Hon. LL.D., St. Andrews, Provost of King's College, Cambridge. 8*s.* 6*d.* net.

14. **The Lost Apocrypha of the Old Testament**
    By M. R. James, Litt.D. 5*s.* 6*d.* net.

SECOND SERIES—Hellenistic-Jewish Texts

1. **The Wisdom of Solomon**
   By W. O. E. Oesterley, D.D. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

2. **The Sibylline Oracles (Books iii-v)**
   By the Rev. H. N. Bate, M.A., Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of London. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

3. **The Letter of Aristeas**
   By H. St. John Thackeray, M.A., King's College, Cambridge. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

4. **Selections from Philo**

5. **Selections from Josephus**
   By H. St. J. Thackeray, M.A. *5s.* net.

6. **The Third and Fourth Books of Maccabees**
   By the Rev. C. W. Emmet, B.D. *3s. 6d.* net.

7. **The Book of Joseph and Asenath**
   Translated from the Greek text by E. W. Brooks. *3s. 6d.* net.

THIRD SERIES—Palestinian-Jewish and Cognate Texts (Rabbinic)

*1. **The Sayings of the Jewish Fathers (Pirke Aboth).** Translated from the Hebrew by W. O. E. Oesterley, D.D. *5s.* net.

*2. **Tractate Berakoth (Benedictions).** Translated with Introduction and Notes by A. Lukyn Williams, D.D. *6s.* net.

*3. **Yoma.** By the Rev. Canon Box.

*4. **Shabbath.** By W. O. E. Oesterley, D.D.

*5. **Tractate Sanhedrin.** Mishnah and Tosefta. The Judicial procedure of the Jews as codified towards the end of the second century A.D. Translated from the Hebrew, with brief Annotations, by the Rev. Herbert Danby, M.A. *6s.* net.

*6. **Kimhi's Commentary on the Psalms** (Book I, Selections). By the Rev. R. G. Finch, B.D. *7s. 6d.* net.

7. Tamid
8. Aboda Zara
9. Middoth
10. Sopherim
11. Megilla
12. Sukka
13. Taanith
14. Megillath Taanith

* It is proposed to publish these texts first by way of experiment. If the Series should so far prove successful the others will follow. Nos. 1, 5 and 6 are now ready.

Jewish Literature and Christian Origins:

Vol. I. The Apocalyptic Literature.

,, II. A Short Survey of the Literature of Rabbinical and Mediæval Judaism.

By W. O. E. OESTERLEY, M.A., D.D., and G. H. BOX, M.A., D.D. 12*s.* 6*d.* net.

The Uncanonical Jewish Books

A Short Introduction to the Apocrypha and the Jewish Writings 200 B.C.–A.D. 100. By WILLIAM JOHN FERRAR, M.A. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Translations of Christian Literature

General Editors:

W. J. SPARROW SIMPSON, D.D.; W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE, B.D.

A NUMBER of translations from the Fathers have already been published by the S.P.C.K. under the title "Early Church Classics." It is now proposed to enlarge this series to include texts which are neither "early" nor necessarily "classics." The divisions at present proposed are given below. Volumes belonging to the original series are marked with an asterisk.

SERIES I.—GREEK TEXTS.

Dionysius the Areopagite: The Divine Names and the Mystical Theology. By C. E. ROLT. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

The Library of Photius. By J. H. FREESE, M.A. In 6 Vols. Vol. I. 10*s.* net.

The Apocriticus of Macarius Magnes. By T. W. CRAFER, D.D. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

***The Epistle of St. Clement, Bishop of Rome.** By the Rt. Rev. J. A. F. GREGG, D.D. 1*s.* 9*d.* net.

***Clement of Alexandria: Who is the Rich Man that is being saved?** By P. M. BARNARD, B.D. 1*s.* 9*d.* net.

***St. Chrysostom: On the Priesthood.** By T. A. MOXON. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

SERIES I.—GREEK TEXTS (*continued*).

The Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles. By C. Bigg, D.D. Revised by the Right Rev. A. J. Maclean, D.D. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

***The Epistle to Diognetus.** By the Rt. Rev. L. B. Radford, D.D. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

St. Dionysius of Alexandria. By C. L. Feltoe, D.D. 4*s.* net.

***The Epistle of the Gallican Churches: Lugdunum and Vienna.** With an Appendix containing Tertullian's Address to Martyrs and the Passion of St. Perpetua. By T. H. Bindley, D.D. 1*s.* 9*d.* net.

***St. Gregory of Nyssa: The Catechetical Oration.** By the Ven. J. H. Srawley, D.D. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

***St. Gregory of Nyssa: The Life of St. Macrina.** By W. K. Lowther Clarke, B.D. 1*s.* 9*d.* net.

Gregory Thaumaturgus (Origen the Teacher): the Address of Gregory to Origen, with Origen's Letter to Gregory. By W. Metcalfe, B.D. 3*s.* 6*d.* net. [*Re-issue.*

***The Shepherd of Hermas.** By C. Taylor, D.D. 2 vols. 2*s.* 6*d.* each net.

Eusebius: The Proof of the Gospel. By W. J. Ferrar 2 vols. 30*s.* net. (*Not sold separately.*)

Hippolytus: Philosophumena. By F. Legge. 2 vols. 30*s.* net. (*Not sold separately.*)

The Epistles of St. Ignatius. By the Ven. J. H. Srawley, D.D. 4*s.* net.

***St. Irenaeus: Against the Heresies.** By F. R. M. Hitchcock, D.D. 2 vols. 2*s.* 6*d.* each net.

Palladius: The Lausiac History. By W. K. Lowther Clarke, B.D. 5*s.* net.

***St. Polycarp.** By B. Jackson. 1*s.* 9*d.* net.

SERIES I.—GREEK TEXTS (*continued*).

The Dialogue of Palladius concerning the Life of Chrysostom. By HERBERT MOORE. 8*s.* 6*d.* net.

Fifty Spiritual Homilies of St. Macarius the Egyptian. By A. J. MASON, D.D. 15*s.* net.

SERIES II.—LATIN TEXTS.

Tertullian's Treatises concerning Prayer, concerning Baptism. By A. SOUTER, D.Litt. 3*s.* net.

Tertullian against Praxeas. By A. SOUTER, D.Litt. 5*s.* net.

Tertullian concerning the Resurrection of the Flesh. By A. SOUTER, D.Litt.

Novatian on the Trinity. By H. MOORE. 6*s.* net.

***St. Augustine: The City of God.** By F. R. M. HITCHCOCK, D.D. 2*s.* net.

***St. Cyprian: The Lord's Prayer.** By T. H. BINDLEY, D.D. 2*s.* net.

Minucius Felix: The Octavius. By J. H. FREESE. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

***Tertullian: On the Testimony of the Soul and On the Prescription of Heretics.** By T. H. BINDLEY, D.D. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

***St. Vincent of Lerins: The Commonitory.** By T. H. BINDLEY, D.D. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

St. Bernard: Concerning Grace and Free Will. By WATKIN W. WILLIAMS. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

The Life of Otto: Apostle of Pomerania, 1060–1139. By EBO and HERBORDUS. Translated by CHARLES H. ROBINSON, D.D. 8*s.* 6*d.* net.

Anskar, the Apostle of the North, 801–865. By CHARLES H. ROBINSON, D.D. Translated from the Vita Anskarii by BISHOP RIMBERT, his fellow-missionary and successor. 4*s.* net. [Published by S.P.G.]

SERIES II.—LATIN TEXTS (*continued*).

Select Epistles of St. Cyprian treating of the Episcopate. Edited with Introduction and Notes by T. A. LACEY, M.A.

SERIES III.—LITURGICAL TEXTS.

EDITED BY C. L. FELTOE, D.D.

St. Ambrose: On the Mysteries and on the Sacraments. By T. THOMPSON, B.D., and J. H. SRAWLEY, D.D. 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

***The Apostolic Constitution and Cognate Documents, with special reference to their Liturgical elements.** By DE LACY O'LEARY, D.D. 1*s.* 9*d.* net.

***The Liturgy of the Eighth Book of the Apostolic Constitution, commonly called the Clementine Liturgy.** By R. H. CRESSWELL. 2*s.* net.

The Pilgrimage of Etheria. By M. L. MCCLURE. 6*s.* net.

***Bishop Sarapion's Prayer-Book.** By the Rt. Rev. J. WORDSWORTH, D.D. 2*s.* net.

The Swedish Rite. By E. E. YELVERTON. 8*s.* 6*d.* net.

Twenty-five Consecration Prayers. With Notes and Introduction by ARTHUR LINTON. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

SERIES IV.—ORIENTAL TEXTS.

The Ethiopic Didascalia. By J. M. HARDEN, B.D. 9*s.* net.

The Apostolic Preaching of Irenaeus (Armenian). By J. A. ROBINSON, D.D. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

SERIES V.—LIVES OF THE CELTIC SAINTS.

EDITED BY ELEANOR HULL.

St. Malachy of Armagh (St. Bernard). By H. J. LAWLOR, D.D. 12*s.* net.

The Latin and Irish Lives of Ciaran. Translated and Annotated by R. A. STEWART MACALISTER, Litt.D., F.S.A. 10*s.* net.

St. Patrick: Life and Works. By N. J. D. WHITE, D.D. 6*s.* 6*d.* net.

SERIES VI.—SELECT PASSAGES.

Documents Illustrative of the History of the Church. Vol. I. To A.D. 313. Edited by B. J. KIDD, D.D. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

SERIES VII.—MODERN EUROPEAN LANGUAGES.

Lives of the Serbian Saints. By VOVESLAV YANICH, DD., and C. P. HANKEY, M.A. 6*s.* 6*d.* net.

Handbooks of Christian Literature

The Letters of St. Augustine. By the Rev. Canon W. J. SPARROW SIMPSON, D.D. 10*s.* net.

The Early Christian Books. A Short Introduction to Christian Literature to the Middle of the Second Century. By the Rev. W. JOHN FERRAR, M.A. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

The Inspiration and Authority of Holy Scripture. A Study in the Literature of the First Five Centuries. By G. DUNCAN BARRY, B.D. 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

The Eucharistic Office of the Book of Common Prayer. By the Rev. LESLIE WRIGHT, M.A., B.D. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Helps for Students of History

Edited by C. JOHNSON, M.A., H. W. V. TEMPERLEY, M.A., and J. P. WHITNEY, D.D., D.C.L.

1. **Episcopal Registers of England and Wales.** By R. C. FOWLER, B.A., F.S.A. 6*d.* net.
2. **Municipal Records.** By F. J. C. HEARNSHAW, M.A. 6*d.* net.
3. **Medieval Reckonings of Time.** By REGINALD L. POOLE, LL.D., Litt.D. 6*d.* net.
4. **The Public Record Office.** By C. JOHNSON, M.A. 6*d.* net.

5. **The Care of Documents.** By C. JOHNSON, M.A. 6*d.* net.
6. **The Logic of History.** By C. G. CRUMP. 8*d.* net.
7. **Documents in the Public Record Office, Dublin.** By R. H. MURRAY, Litt.D. 8*d.* net.
8. **The French Wars of Religion.** By ARTHUR A. TILLEY, M.A. 6*d.* net.

By Sir A. W. WARD, Litt.D., F.B.A.

9. **The Period of Congresses—I. Introductory.** 8*d.* net.
10. **The Period of Congresses—II. Vienna and the Second Peace of Paris.** 1*s.* net.
11. **The Period of Congresses—III. Aix-la-Chapelle to Verona.** 1*s.* net.

Nos. 9, 10, and 11 in one volume, cloth, 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

12. **Securities of Peace: A Retrospect (1848–1914).** Paper, 2*s.* net; cloth, 3*s.* net.

---

13. **The French Renaissance.** By A. A. TILLEY, M.A. 8*d.* net.
14. **Hints on the Study of English Economic History.** By W. CUNNINGHAM, D.D., F.B.A., F.S.A. 8*d.* net.
15. **Parish History and Records.** By A. HAMILTON THOMPSON, M.A., F.S.A. 8*d.* net.
16. **A Short Introduction to the Study of Colonial History.** By A. P. NEWTON, M.A., D.Litt. 6*d.* net.
17. **The Wanderings and Homes of Manuscripts.** By M. R. JAMES, Litt.D., F.B.A. Paper, 2*s.*; cloth, 3*s.* net.
18. **Ecclesiastical Records.** By the Rev. CLAUDE JENKINS, M.A., Librarian of Lambeth Palace. 1*s.* 9*d.* net.
19. **An Introduction to the History of American Diplomacy.** By CARL RUSSELL FISH, Ph.D. 1*s.* net.

20. **Hints on Translation from Latin into English.** By Alexander Souter, D.Litt. 6*d.* net.

21. **Hints on the Study of Latin (A.D. 125-750).** By Alexander Souter, D.Litt. 8*d.* net.

22. **Report of the Historical MSS. Commission.** By R. A. Roberts, F.R.Hist.S. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

23. **A Guide to Franciscan Studies.** By A. G. Little. 1*s.* 6*d.* net.

24. **A Guide to the History of Education.** By John William Adamson. 8*d.* net.

25. **Introduction to the Study of Russian History.** By W. F. Reddaway. 6*d.* net.

26. **Monuments of English Municipal Life.** By W. Cunningham, D.D., F.B.A. 1*s.* net.

27. **La Guyenne Pendant la Domination Anglaise, 1152-1453.** Par Charles Bémont. 1*s.* 4*d.* net.

28. **The Historical Criticism of Documents.** By R. L. Marshall, M.A., LL.D. 1*s.* 3*d.* net.

29. **The French Revolution.** By G. P. Gooch. 8*d.* net.

30. **Seals.** By H. S. Kingsford. 1*s.* 3*d.* net.

31. **A Student's Guide to the Manuscripts of the British Museum.** By Julius P. Gilson, M.A. 1*s.* net.

32. **A Short Guide to some Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin.** By Robert H. Murray, Litt.D. 1*s.* 9*d.*

33–35. **Ireland.** No. 33, 1494–1603; No. 34, 1603–1714; No. 35, 1714–1829. By R. H. Murray, Litt.D. Each, 1*s.* net.

Nos. 33–35 in one volume. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

36. **Coins and Medals.** By G. F. Hill, M.A., F.B.A. 1*s.* 6*d.* net.

37. **The Latin Orient.** By W. Miller, M.A. 1*s.* 6*d.* net.

38. **The Turkish Restoration in Greece, 1718-1797.** By William Miller, M.A. 1*s.* 3*d.* net.

39. **Sources for the History of Roman Catholics in England, Ireland and Scotland.** From the Reformation period to that of the Emancipation, 1533–1795. By John Hungerford Pollen, S.J. 1*s.* 3*d.* net.

40. **English Time Books.—Vol. I. English Regnal Years and Titles, Hand-lists, Easter Dates, etc.** Compiled by J. E. W. Wallis, M.A. 4*s.* net.

41. **Knights of Malta, 1523–1798.** By R. Cohen. 2*s.* net.

42. **Records for the Early History of South Africa.** By C. Graham Botha. 1*s.* net.

43. **The Western Manuscripts of the Bodleian Library.** By H. H. E. Craster, D.Litt. 1*s.* 3*d.* net.

44. **Geographical Factors.** By H. J. Fleure. 6*d.* net.

45. **The Colonial Entry Books. A Brief Guide to the Colonial Records in the Public Record Office before 1696.** By C. S. S. Higham, M.A. 1*s.* 6*d.* net.

The Story of the English Towns

The Times Literary Supplement says: "This attractive series." **The Bookman** says: "A series that is to be commended."

Popular but Scholarly Histories of English Towns, for the general reader, but suitable also for use in schools. With Maps, Plans, and Illustrations. Cloth boards. 4*s.* net.

The City of London. By P. H. Ditchfield, M.A., F.S.A.

Birmingham. By J. H. B. Masterman.

Harrogate and Knaresborough. By J. S. Fletcher.

Hastings. By L. F. Salzman, M.A., F.S.A.

Leeds. By J. S. Fletcher.

Nottingham. By E. L. Guilford, M.A.

Peterborough. By K. and R. E. Roberts.

Plymouth. By A. L. Salmon.

Pontefract. By J. S. Fletcher.

St. Albans. By W. Page, F.S.A.

Sheffield. By J. S. Fletcher.

Westminster. By H. F. Westlake, M.A., F.S.A.

In the Press— **Bath, Halifax, etc.**

Studies in Church History

Some Eighteenth-Century Churchmen: Glimpses of English Church Life in the Eighteenth Century. By G. Lacey May, M.A. With Illustrations. Cloth, 9*s.* net.

Christian Monasticism in Egypt to the Close of the Fourth Century. By W. H. Mackean, D.D. Cloth boards. 8*s.* net.

The Venerable Bede. His Life and Writings. By the Right Rev. G. F. Browne, D.D. With Illustrations. Cloth boards, 10*s.* net.

The Reformation in Ireland. A Study of Ecclesiastical Legislation. By H. Holloway, M.A. Cloth, 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

The Emperor Julian. An Essay on His Relations with the Christian Religion. By Edward J. Martin, B.D. Cloth boards, 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

The Importance of Women in Anglo-Saxon Times; The Cultus of St. Peter and St. Paul, and other Addresses. By the Right Rev. G. F. Browne, D.D. With two Illustrations. Cloth boards, 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Essays Liturgical and Historical. By J. Wickham Legg, D.Litt., F.S.A. Cloth boards, 5*s.* net.

French Catholics in the Nineteenth Century. By the Rev. W. J. Sparrow Simpson, D.D. Cloth, 5*s.* net.

An Abbot of Vézelay. By Rose Graham, F.R.Hist.S. With eight Illustrations. Cloth boards, 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Texts for Students

General Editors: CAROLINE A. J. SKEEL, D.Lit.; H. J. WHITE, D.D.; J. P. WHITNEY, D.D., D.C.L.

1. **Select Passages from Josephus, Tacitus, Suetonius, Dio Cassius,** illustrative of Christianity in the First Century. Arranged by H. J. WHITE, D.D. 3*d*. net.

2. **Selections from Matthew Paris.** By C. A. J. SKEEL, D.Lit. 9*d*. net.

3. **Selections from Giraldus Cambrensis.** By C. A. J. SKEEL, D.Lit. 9*d*. net.

4. **Libri Sancti Patricii.** The Latin Writings of St. Patrick, etc. By NEWPORT J. D. WHITE, D.D. 6*d*. net.

5. **A Translation of the Latin Writings of St. Patrick.** By NEWPORT J. D. WHITE, D.D. 6*d*. net.

6. **Selections from the Vulgate.** 9*d*. net.

7. **The Epistle of St. Clement of Rome.** 6*d*. net.

8. **Select Extracts from Chronicles and Records relating to English Towns in the Middle Ages.** Edited, with Introduction, Notes, and Glossary, by F. J. C. HEARNSHAW, M.A., LL.D. 9*d*. net.

9. **The Inscription on the Stele of Méša.** Commonly called the Moabite Stone. The text in Moabite and Hebrew, translated by the Rev. H. F. B. COMPSTON, M.A. 6*d*. net.

10. **The Epistles of St. Ignatius.** Edited by T. W. CRAFER, D.D. 1*s*. net.

11. **Christian Inscriptions.** By H. P. V. NUNN, M.A. With two Illustrations. 1*s*. net.

12. **Selections from the "Historia Rerum Anglicarum" of William of Newburgh.** 1*s*. 3*d*. net.

13. **The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles.** By T. W. CRAFER, D.D. 4*d*. net.

13A. **An English Translation of the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles.** 3*d*. net.

14. **The Epistle of Barnabas.** Edited by T. W. CRAFER D.D. 6*d*. net.

15. **The Code of Hammurabi.** By PERCY HANDCOCK, M.A. 1*s.* net.

16. **Selections from the Tell El-Amarna Letters.** By PERCY HANDCOCK, M.A. 4*d.* net.

17. **Select Passages Illustrating Commercial and Diplomatic Relations between England and Russia.** By A. WEINER, M.A., F.R.Hist.S. 1*s.* 6*d.* net.

18. **The Early History of the Slavonic Settlements in Dalmatia, Croatia and Serbia.** By J. B. BURY, F.B.A. 2*s.* net.

19. **Select Extracts illustrating Florentine Life in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries.** By E. G. ROPER, B.A. 1*s.* net.

20. **Select Extracts Illustrating Florentine Life in the Fifteenth Century.** By ESTHER G. ROPER, B.A. 1*s.* net.

21. **Itinerarium Regis Ricardi.** By M. T. STEAD. 1*s.* 9*d.*

22. **The Second Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians.** Edited by T. W. CRAFER, D.D. 6*d.* net.

23. **Select Extracts Illustrating Sports and Pastimes in the Middle Ages.** By E. L. GUILFORD, M.A. 1*s.* 9*d.* net.

24. **Babylonian Flood Stories.** By P. HANDCOCK, M.A. 6*d.* net.

25. **Babylonian Penitential Psalms.** By P. HANDCOCK, M.A. 6*d.* net.

26. **The Hymn of Cleanthes.** Greek text translated into English, with brief Introduction and Notes by E. H. BLAKENEY, M.A. 6*d.* net.

27. **The Foundations of Modern Ireland.** Part I. The Civil Policy of Henry VIII. and the Reformation. By CONSTANTIA MAXWELL, M.A. 1*s.* 6*d.* net.

31. **Sukkah. (A Critical Hebrew Text.)** By A. W. GREENUP, D.D. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Pioneers of Progress

The Manchester Guardian says: "Admirable 'Pioneers of Progress' series."

MEN OF SCIENCE: Edited by S. CHAPMAN, M.A., D.Sc.

With Portrait. Paper cover, 1*s.* 6*d.*; cloth, 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Galileo. By W. W. BRYANT, F.R.A.S.

Michael Faraday. By J. A. CROWTHER, D.Sc.

Alfred Russel Wallace. The Story of a Great Discoverer. By LANCELOT T. HOGBEN, B.A., B.Sc.

Joseph Priestley. By D. H. PEACOCK, B.A., M.Sc., F.I.C.

Joseph Dalton Hooker, O.M., G.C.S.I., C.B., F.R.S., M.D., etc. By Professor F. O. BOWER, Sc.D., F.R.S.

Herschel. By the Rev. HECTOR MACPHERSON, M.A., F.R.A.S., F.R.S.E.

Archimedes. By Sir THOMAS L. HEATH, K.C.B., F.R.S.

The Copernicus of Antiquity (Aristarchus of Samos). By Sir THOMAS L. HEATH, K.C.B., F.R.S.

John Dalton. By L. J. NEVILLE-POLLEY, B.Sc.

Kepler. By WALTER W. BRYANT, F.R.A.S.

EMPIRE BUILDERS: Edited by A. P. NEWTON, M.A., D.Litt., B.Sc., and W. BASIL WORSFOLD, M.A.

With Portrait. Paper cover, 1*s.* 6*d.*; cloth, 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Sir Francis Drake. By WALTER J. HARTE, M.A.

Sir Robert Sandeman. By A. L. P. TUCKER, C.I.E.

WOMEN: Edited by ETHEL M. BARTON.

With Illustrations. Paper cover, 2*s.* 6*d.*; cloth, 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Florence Nightingale. By E. F. HALL.

Dorothea Beale. By ELIZABETH H. SHILLITO, B.A.

Elsie Inglis. By EVA SHAW MCLAREN.

[25.10.21.

Printed in Great Britain by R. Clay & Sons, Ltd., Bungay, Suffolk.